HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XL JULY, 1947 NUMBER 3

IRENAEUS: MOSTLY PROLEGOMENA

MORTON S. ENSLIN
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Toward the end of the fourth book of his indispensable Church History Eusebius remarked:

> At this time there flourished in the church Hegesippus, whom we know from former narratives, and Dionysius, bishop of the Corinthians, and Pinytus, another bishop of the Cretans, and in addition to them Philip and Apolinarius and Melito and Musanus and Modestus and, above all, Irenaeus, and their correct opinions on the sound faith of the apostolic tradition have come down to us in writing.[1]

No better introduction to the significance of Irenaeus, for many years bishop of Lyons, could be desired. For first, last, and all the time, Irenaeus stands as the indefatigable guardian of the true faith not only of the Christians in the pleasant valley of the Rhone, for whom he felt especial responsibility, but of all Christians everywhere. Thus he can conclude his Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching:

> This, beloved, is the preaching of the truth, and this is the manner of our redemption, and this is the way of life, which the prophets proclaimed, and Christ established, and the apostles delivered, and the church in all the world hands on to her children. This must we keep with all certainty, with a sound will and pleasing to God, with good works and right-willed disposition.[2]

A far step this from Paul's repeated and heartfelt prayer that the bickerings and jealousies among the individual Christians in the little outposts which he was endeavoring to establish might cease, and that led him to plead with those in Corinth that no divisions be permitted, but that they might be perfected "in the same mind and in the same judgment"; [3] or with the Philippians that they

[1] Eusebius, H. E. iv, 21, 1. [2] Dem. 98. [3] I Cor. 1:10.

should "be of the same mind, having the same love," and evidencing that wholesome state by their lack of "faction and vainglory" [4] — in a word, insofar as they were able, to be at peace with all men.[5]

Instead we are in the world of the far later Jude, who could insist that his readers "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints," [6] and of that late-second-century Patroclus who had the zeal, but not the insight, of the greater Achilles whose armor he sought to wear: "O Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so-called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith." [7] For by now there is a church which can be described as possessing the "succession from the apostles," [8] which is the "synagogue of God, which God — that is, the Son himself — has gathered by himself"; [9] which alone has the truth and is the sole "entrance to life," [10] with the result that those who are outside it are beyond the pale of the truth.[11] In a word, in the place of independent and self-sufficient churches, often cantankerous and tough-bitted, but vigorous and virile, we find one church which thought of itself — or whose leaders thought of it — as being "throughout all the world, having its origin firm from the apostles," and "persevering in one and the same opinion" with regard to

[4] Phil. 2:2 ff.
[5] Rom. 12:18.
[6] Jude 3.
[7] I Tim. 6:20 f.
[8] Irenaeus, adv. Haer. iv, 26, 2. References in this essay to Irenaeus' principal writing (see p. 146) are in terms of Massuet's divisions, since these are in common use. Harvey's edition (Sancti Irenaei Libros quinque adversus Haereses, Cambridge, 1857), which is indispensable for the student, employs a somewhat different division, but prints at the head of each page the corresponding sections of both Massuet and Grabe. The reader who is not restricted to the English translation will thus have no difficulty in locating the sections cited; to have cited the sections on the basis of Harvey would, on the other hand, have been confusing to the general reader, quite independent of his ability to make use of Greek and Latin, for unfortunately Harvey's edition is not to be found on as many library shelves as it deserves to be. Any translation of Irenaeus to be intelligible must of necessity at times be somewhat free and paraphrastic. While not occasionally I have made my own translation, I have frequently reproduced (with such alterations as appeared to me wise) that of Roberts and Rambaut in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library.
[9] adv. Haer. iii, 6, 1.
[10] adv. Haer. iii, 4, 1.
[11] adv. Haer. iv, 33, 7 — . . . *qui sunt extra veritatem, id est, qui sunt extra ecclesiam.*

Christian faith, which faith was no longer a radiant way of life but a set of beliefs which must be held implicitly and without modification as the price of admission to life eternal.[12]

This is the constant burden of Irenaeus. Again and again he sounds this note and rings its changes. Thus he can say:

> True knowledge is [that which consists in] the doctrine of the apostles, and the ancient constitution of the church throughout all the world, and the distinctive manifestation of the body of Christ (*character corporis Christi*) according to the successions of the bishops, by which they have handed down that church which exists in every place, and which has come even unto us, being guarded and preserved, without any forging of scripture (*sine fictione scripturarum*), by a very complete system of doctrine (*tractatione plenissima*), and neither receiving addition nor suffering curtailment [sc. in the truth which she believes]; and it consists in reading the word of God without falsification, and a lawful and diligent examination in harmony with the scriptures, without danger and without blasphemy; and [it consists in] the preëminent gift of love, which is more precious than knowledge, more glorious than prophecy, and which excels all the other gifts of God.
>
> Wherefore the church does in every place, because of that love which she cherishes toward God, send forward, throughout all time (*in omni tempore*) a multitude of martyrs to the Father; while all others [he means, of course, the heretics] not only have nothing of this kind to point to among themselves, but even maintain that such witness-bearing is not at all necessary, for [they affirm that] their system of doctrines is the true witness, with the exception, perhaps, that one or two among them, during the whole time which has elapsed since the Lord appeared on earth, have occasionally, along with our martyrs, borne the reproach of the name (as if he too [sc. the heretic] had obtained mercy), and have been led forth with them [sc. to death], being as it were a sort of retinue granted unto them. For the church alone sustains with purity the reproach of those who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake, and endure all sorts of punishments, and are put to death because of the love which they bear to God, and their confession of his Son; often weakened indeed, yet immediately increasing her members, and becoming whole again, after the same manner of her type, Lot's wife, who became a pillar of salt. Thus, too, [she passes through an experience] similar to that of the ancient prophets, as the Lord declares, "For so persecuted they the prophets that were before you"; since she suffers persecutions

[12] adv. Haer. iii, 12, 7.

from those who do not receive the will of God, in a new fashion, to be sure, but with the self-same spirit resting upon her as upon these ancient prophets.[13]

The Catholic church had arrived, with her watchword: *Semper, ubique, et ab omnibus.*

Nor is the appearance of this army, which since the last quarter of the second century has persistently, if at times a bit self-consciously, insisted, "All one body we," hard to explain. However much its champions from the days of Irenaeus to the present may insist that it was the normal, or, as many would prefer to say, the supernatural, development of the divinely sown seed, it is nevertheless clear, will we but read the story, that it was in no small part due to causes of a prosaic, not to say mundane, nature.

The Christian movement began as an obscure sect of Jews. As the years went by, its original connections with Judaism were broken, and it became its antagonist. For the first century of its existence, although it was making converts at a rapid rate — dangerously rapid in the judgment of some of its critics, both Jews and gentiles; of the latter especially those in positions of responsibility — it was held for the most part in contempt. To the average outsider it had none of the attributes of a genuine cult, rather it was an unorganized congeries of absurd and irresponsible fanatics. At all times it was subject to suppression as an illegal religion; occasionally the authorities subjected some of these, commonly dubbed, "haters of the human race" to punishment and torture, but such actions were local, unorganized, and infrequent. Individual Christians might get into trouble; as yet there was no concerted movement against them. Nonetheless the very fact that every hand did seem raised against them, the fact that there was a continuous "open season," and that consequently one could never tell when the lightning might fall — this coupled with the remarkable or exasperating (it depended on one's point of view) insistence that they and they alone were right and doing the will of God gave them a strength and to no small degree aided them in their burning sense of

[13] adv. Haer. iv, 33, 8 f.

mission. Not only that, this feeling of being alone, in an unfriendly world, where every hand was raised against them, could not but throw them the closer together and thus to sow the seed of union, if not of unity. At the moment, however, it had not resulted in more than a feeling of cameraderie in the face of a common danger, not of fundamental agreement on a common course, to say nothing of a clearly defined all-embracive faith. But the seed for that, too, had been sown.

Each year that elapsed tended to result, as is always the case, in a lessened enthusiasm for trail blazing, a greater willingness to follow the paths already made, even if they were crooked ones. And each year tended to cause early voices, originally considered strident and exasperating, to take on the melodious and sonorous clang of authority: they were the leaders, we the followers. But still, although these several elements were not without effect, no one of them — nor they all together — would have been sufficient to work the transformation. Another element was necessary, and that element was at hand. The factor which, more than all others, made possible the Catholic church, with its faith once for all delivered, was the challenge by groups, nominally, at least for the most part, Christian, but for one reason or another regarded with disfavor: the schismatic or, as they came to be regarded, heretical elements. For at least five or six decades there had been a steady growth of a type of thought that seemed to an increasing number of disturbed Christians hostile to the very foundations of their religion: the denial of what had been central, as they believed, from the very beginning of the scriptures, the divine and unquestioned rule of one sole God, which carried with it such other essentials as the certainty of the divine justice and the freedom of the human will.

As over against this was a type of speculation, contemptuously dubbed *Gnostic* because the adherents laid claim to a superior and higher *gnosis*, which denied, or seemed so to do, the unity of the godhead, which threw into a disreputable light the divine Creator, and rendered the notion of the real incarnation of the one believed to be in a peculiar sense the Creator's son and Messiah meaningless by the theory of a pleroma of aeons, of which he was — like a recent Pandora — but the later and com-

bined product. In addition, the fundamental ethical ideas, which, however much the developing religion was changing in consequence of its contacts in the Graeco-oriental world, were central to the Christian confidence, seemed to be destroyed by the Gnostic contention of three distinct and separate races of mankind, of which only the *pneumatikoi* or "spiritual" would enter the realm of light. Thus the whole foundation of free will and responsibility seemed threatened by an ironclad and heathenish conception of necessity.

Through the years, furthermore, this little struggling religion had the confidence of antiquity and of ultimate victory. It had scriptures which it fondly believed were older than all other writings, scriptures which were theirs in a unique sense, although wicked Jews might claim them, and which not only foreshadowed their movement but certified its triumph in every page. And along with these scriptures there had grown up other writings from the early leaders, which in the course of the years had become increasingly dear to Christians. Now suddenly in the midst of the second century arose a figure who seemed to outraged eyes to attack and distort all of these. Their time-hallowed scriptures he ruthlessly threw overboard as the worthless production of an inferior deity which he, in common with other opponents, had styled contemptuously the "creator" (*demiurge*), in contrast to the true and powerful God whom he claimed alone to know. And of all the more recent Christian writings which had become so dear, although an exact determination of their value had never been reached since the question had never been raised, only one gospel and ten letters of Paul were considered of value, and they mutilated and forced to support his outrageous views.

This combination of circumstances — and, as I have tried elsewhere to indicate,[14] I am convinced that Marcion and his activity were by far the most influential — did overnight what might otherwise have taken decades to achieve. A common front was necessary against these insidious foes. Too long independence and individual preferences had been tolerated. Now the insistence was for unity and organization. And, once more, the material was at

[14] "The Pontic Mouse," Anglican Theological Review, XXVII, 1 (January, 1945), pp. 1–16.

hand. Through the years had risen unconsciously the feeling that the end of the age was not so near as had been earlier expected. For Jesus that immediacy had apparently been all-important. Beside it, everything else has paled into invisibility. For Paul, twenty-five years later, there had been a significant change. He, too, expected it to come in his lifetime; nonetheless it was not for him the all-consuming element. Unlike the wandering prophet of Nazareth who had been content to sound the word and pass on to the next city, Paul had established churches, and, willy-nilly, some organization had been bound to arise even if it had apparently been most informal. But by the beginning of the second century the informality of organization in the earlier Pauline churches was lapsing. At least some of the churches had come to have local leaders invested with considerable dignity and authority. Certainly, if the letters of Ignatius of Antioch are genuine, there can be little question as to his insistence that proper regard for the authority of the bishop was essential. Nor was Ignatius a solitary voice.

Thus when the churches finally awoke to the danger represented by the Gnostic speculation, by the contemptuous dismissal of the significance of the incarnation and death of Jesus of Nazareth which Docetism seemed to make, by the combined attack on God and the Bible by Marcion and his rapidly multiplying followers — when they awoke and decided to organize a common front, they were not without the machinery necessary, as would have been the case fifty years before. The officials in the local churches — bishops, presbyters, presidents; the exact title is of no especial moment — were there and could be effective. Thus seemingly overnight we find emerging one reasonably united, if not actually unified, church, of which the individual churches from high up on the Rhone to beyond the rivers of the Fertile Crescent, from the Euxine to Egypt and the northern coast of Africa, were parts, set for the defense of what for want of better name may be called the standard brand of Christianity. This is by no means to imply that complete uniformity had been achieved. After nearly two thousand years we are still far from that position; and happily so, some may feel. Far from it. The very fact of achieving this semiunity was to result in cleavage. As Paul

had argued: Until the law said, "Do not," the one who did was hardly to be considered guilty of sin. So here. So long as there was no standard brand to be defended, there really could be no heresy. But now that this new departure had been made, of course hostages were given to fortune. And one controversy after another was to wrack and test the newly born church of all the world, to see if a church so conceived and so dedicated could long endure. One need but refer to the unceasing discussion as to what was, what was not, Christian scripture, to the Arian and Pelagian controversies, not to mention such lesser disturbances as the Quartodeciman and Patripassian and Montanist, to indicate that the surest way to invite diversity is to insist on unity; or better said: as soon as it becomes essential to define the true faith, difficulties and divergences are bound to arise. Steam produced from water boiling in an open container over a fire will not do any work, but it will not explode. Enclose it in a boiler, and you gain a much more effective agent — but a much more dangerous one. And the church through long and sad experiences was to learn that it was desperately unwise to dispense with safety valves or to tie them down, even though otherwise no little steam would be lost.

But it is now high time to cease from pleasant philosophizing and to revert to Irenaeus whom we left standing in the first paragraph.

The real significance of Irenaeus is that it is in his writings that we find for the first time an organized Christian front, a church that can be regarded as catholic, and a detailed and specific concern to draw up and define just what one may and may not believe. In a word, in Irenaeus we find the first systematic theologian which the new movement had produced, and its first systematic heresiologist.

Few details of Irenaeus' life are known. We first find him living at Lyons, or as it was then known Lugdunum, in the valley of the Rhone and prominent in the local church. On the other hand, it is highly probable that he was a native of Asia Minor and had resided for a time at least in or near Smyrna, for twice he refers to having seen and heard the aged Polycarp in Asia Minor. Polycarp suffered martyrdom in 155, at the age of eighty-six.

Irenaeus' reference to having heard frequently Polycarp cry out in displeasure, "O good God, for what times hast thou preserved me that I should endure this!" [15] surely implies that by this time Polycarp was an old man. Quite regardless of the exact meaning of the two phrases which Irenaeus used to describe himself in those days (*παῖς ἔτι ὤν* [16] and *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*) [17] and which have led to lengthy, if not decisive, discussion,[18] the way Irenaeus refers to this contact and the fact that he had a "more vivid recollection of what occurred at that time than of recent events, for what we learn as children grows up with the soul and is united to it" [19] imply that it had taken place many years before and that he himself, at the time of writing, had been far from being a young man. Since that particular fragment [20] preserved by Eusebius can be dated as coming from the last decade of the second century, it is not an improbable guess that Irenaeus at that time was well along in his late fifties or sixties. He became bishop of Lyons in 177, and presumably was at that time no newcomer to Gaul. Thus his birth may be dated with reasonable probability in the decade 130–140, or, more conveniently ca. A.D. 135. Nothing is known of his death. The notion that he died a martyr in the days of Septimus Severus (ca. 202) would appear to rest on no solid foundation. In the present text of Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah he is styled *vir apostolicus episcopus Lugdunensis et martyr*,[21] but in the earlier de Viris Inlustribus there is no such allusion. The silence of all the early fathers on this point makes Jerome's word highly suspicious; it may well be a late interpolation into the text. Regularly he is styled simply "Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons," even in contexts where the title "martyr," if properly his, would have been highly natural.[22] In a quotation from the Quaestiones et Responsiones

[15] Eusebius, H. E. v, 20, 7.

[16] Ibid., v, 20, 5.

[17] adv. Haer. iii, 3, 4.

[18] See Harvey, op. cit. I, pp. cliv f. and Lipsius, "Irenaeus," Dict. Christ. Biogr. III, pp. 253 f. For a recent discussion see "Orientations Théologiques chez Saint Irénée," by Th.-André Audet in Traditio I (1943), p. 19, note 10. The whole article (pp. 15–54) is well worth reading.

[19] Eusebius, H. E. v, 20, 5 f.

[20] It is from the de Ogdoade.

[21] in Isaiam xvii (on 64:4 f.) — Opera ed. Martianaei iv, 623A.

[22] Cf. Harvey, op. cit., I, p. clxii.

ad Orthodoxos, formerly ascribed to Justin, but clearly not earlier than the fourth century and now usually printed among the fragments of Irenaeus, he is styled "the beloved Irenaeus, the presbyter and bishop of Lyons." [23] A rubric in a Syriac manuscript [24] in the Nitrian collection reads, "Of Irenaeus, whom the heretics slew." Harvey plausibly conjectured that this quite improbable statement was due to confusion with Irenaeus of Sirmium who died a martyr in the days of Diocletian. That he was alive in the last decade of the second century and played a prominent part in the Quartodeciman controversy is certain, though Harvey's remark that that "justifies the supposition that he may have lived through the first five or six years of the third" century [25] would appear to me a *non sequitur*. The fact that a man is prominent in 1947 is scarcely a guarantee that he will be alive in 1953.

Far more important is the fact that during the last quarter of a century he was bishop of the territory of Southern Gaul. During these years, if the Acts of Saint Ferreolus may be trusted,[26] the near-by Besançon and Valence were Christianized. Theodoret [27] styles him the apostolic man who "tilled and illumined the Celts."

But missionarily minded as he may well have been, his burning concern was to preserve the purity of the faith against the ravages of heresy. His principal work, Refutation and Overthrow of Knowledge Falsely So Called, commonly referred to as Against Heresies, must have demanded an immense amount of time and one of comparative leisure. Incidentally it may be remarked that there is no intimation in it, or in any other of his writings known

[23] Frg. 7.

[24] See Harvey, op. cit., II, p. 454. In the Boll. Acta Sanctorum (Vol. XII, p. 99) in the item for April 23 regarding Saint Felix is preserved a reading from "MS Trevirensi S. Maximini, collato cum editione Surii," namely, "*Igitur beatissimus Irenaeus, Lugdunensis urbis episcopus, consequenti tempore martyr.*"

[25] Harvey, op. cit. I, p. clxiii.

[26] Ferreolus and his brother Ferrutio, both said to have been from Asia Minor, were sent by him to evangelize the district around Besançon (Acta Sanctorum, item for June 16; Vol. XXIV, pp. 4–13). At about the same time Felix, Fortunatus, and Aquileius were sent to Valence (op. cit., item for April 23; XII, pp. 98–101). Cf. also Tillemont, Mémoires, III, pp. 42 f., and Martyrologium Romanum I. pp. 110 and 73.

[27] Theodoret, Haeretic. Fab. Comp., prelude and i, 5 (Migne, Patr. Graeca lxxxiii, 339A and 351B).

to us in whole or in part, of any current persecution or other external difficulties in the Gallic churches. This is of especial interest since we first make his acquaintance during the bloody persecution in Lyons and Vienne which cost so many of his fellow Christians, including the aged bishop Pothinus, their lives and which was thus directly responsible for his own elevation to the bishop's chair.

What led Irenaeus to devote himself to the overthrow of Gnosticism and its kindred errors is hard to say. There is no evidence that they had become intrenched in the pleasant valley of the Rhone and were thus of immediate concern to him; and it is certainly scarcely to be maintained that their exposure was simply incidental to his desire to set forth Christian doctrine. On the contrary, while it is perfectly true that in the latter half of his magnum opus he provides what may be called the first systematic exposition of Christian belief, it is equally true that this is quite incidental to his polemic onslaughts. And furthermore, while in the course of the development of his volumes he attacks many and various groups, thus leading to the aptness of the popular designation Against Heresies, there can be but little question that it was the teaching of Valentinus and his disciples, notably Ptolemy, that he had first intended to expose. Not only does he state this explicitly in the preface to the opening book, but remarks again on a later page: "Those, then, who are of the school of Valentinus being overthrown, the whole multitude of heretics are, in fact, subverted." [28] To be sure, the other archheretic was Marcion, and constantly Irenaeus assails him; but the impression which I always receive is that this present work had started out as an especial attack upon Valentinus and that it had expanded in a way not unknown to other authors, ancient and modern. Apparently he had intended at first to devote another work to the refutation of Marcion from the latter's own writings; [29] almost certainly this was not carried into execution, for it would scarcely have been disregarded by his successors.

It has been conjectured that it was in Rome that he first became concerned with the ravages of Gnosticism and determined

[28] adv. Haer. ii, 31, 1.
[29] adv. Haer. i, 27, 4; iii, 12, 12.

its overthrow. This is not improbable although I see no direct evidence to support it. Actually the evidence of Irenaeus' presence in Rome is very meagre. At the end of a later manuscript containing the Martyrdom of Polycarp stands the words, "For at the time of the martyrdom of the bishop Polycarp Irenaeus was in Rome and taught many" (*οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ μαρτυρίου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Πολυκάρπου γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ πολλοὺς ἐδίδαξεν*). This the scribe seeks to support by the statement, "And it is extant in the writings of Irenaeus that on the day and hour in which Polycarp was martyred in Smyrna, Irenaeus, who was in the city of the Romans heard a voice as of a trumpet saying, 'Polycarp has been murdered.' " [30]

That Polycarp himself had been in Rome during the days of Anicetus, that is, shortly before his martyrdom is certain.[31] It might seem tempting to assume that that was the reason for Irenaeus' departure from Smyrna, that is, that he had accompanied his aged idol, and that after a stay in Rome had continued west to the valley of the Rhone. But this is pure conjecture. My own feeling is that it is unwise to emphasize too highly Irenaeus' contact with the venerable bishop of Smyrna. The passing years have an amazing way of increasing one's earlier intimacy with the world's great.

A much more solid fact — although its explanation must remain a problem — was the connection of the Gallic churches with Asia Minor.[32] In the preceding pages mention has been made of the persecution which ravaged the churches of Vienne and Lyons in the year 177. The story is preserved by Eusebius from a lengthy account which was sent from the "slaves of Christ sojourning in Vienne and Lyons in Gaul to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, who have the same faith and hope of redemption. . . ." [33] Details of the tragic story need not be rehearsed here, but attention should be directed to the fact that the harassed churches in Southern Gaul saw fit to send this intimate and detailed account to their "brethren in Asia and Phrygia," and that

[30] This epilogue from the so-called Moscow Ms. is regularly printed, at the end of the text, of the several editions of the Martyrdom of Polycarp.

[31] See (below) p. 153.

[32] See pp. 150 ff., 153 ff.

[33] Eusebius, H. E. v, 1, 3.

two of the martyrs, conspicuous for their gallantry, were "Attalus, a Pergamene by race, who had always been a pillar and support of the Christians there" [34] and "a certain Alexander, a Phrygian by race and a physician by profession, who had lived in Gaul for many years." [35] There is also a tradition[36] that the aged bishop Pothinus, too, was a native of Asia Minor. And, of course, Irenaeus, then a member [37] of the church in Lyons, and who in a manner never explained seems to have escaped the difficulty, apparently hailed from Smyrna.

More important for our purpose than this is the next section in Eusebius. After his lengthy catena of citations from this early Christian martyrology, he continues:

> And at that time the party of Montanus and Alcibiades and Theodotus in Phrygia began first to engender among many their views concerning prophecy (for the many other wonderful works of the grace of God which were still being wrought up to that time in divers churches produced the belief among many that they also were prophets), and when dissension arose about the persons mentioned, the brethren in Gaul again formulated their own judgment, pious and most orthodox, concerning them, subjoining various letters from the martyrs who had been consecrated among them, which letters while they were still in prison they had composed for the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, and also for Eleutherus, who was then bishop of the Romans, and so they were ambassadors for the sake of the peace of the church.[38]

Eusebius' laconic brevity leaves many questions obscure in this section, but the main facts are indisputable. The Montanist movement, which had started in Phrygia sometime in the second half of the century and which had been characterized by frenzied ecstasy and other excesses highly objectionable to many staid Christians in Asia Minor, had finally been officially banned by various of the local bishops. Apparently they had hesitated to do this, for they knew that it would be easy to charge them with opposing prophecy; but they had finally taken the step and had

[34] Ibid., v, 1, 17.
[35] Ibid., v, 1, 49.
[36] This evidence is given by Tillemont, Mémoires, II, p. 156.
[37] That he was at this time "a presbyter" is commonly said. See note 41.
[38] H. E. v, 3, 4.

taken care to justify their action by detailed statements as to the necessity.

So much is clear. But several questions remain: How had the Gallican churches become involved? Which side had appealed to them? What was their reply? Various and contradictory answers have been given to these questions. The decisive factor to me is the attitude of Eusebius. That he heartily disapproved the movement is obvious from his lengthy and bitter survey of it a few pages further on,[39] introduced by the biting words:

> The enemy of the church of God, who hates good and loves deeply all that is wicked, left untried no kind of plot against men and again strove to raise up strange heresies against the church. Of these some like poisonous reptiles crawled over Asia and Phrygia, and boasted that Montanus was the Paraclete and that the women of his cult, Priscilla and Maximilla, were the prophetesses of Montanus.

There would seem little question that when he describes the judgment of the Gallican churches on the issue now threatening the peace of Asia as "pious and most orthodox" he meant that they too had agreed with the disapproving bishops.

Apparently then the situation can be reconstructed as follows: In accord with their desire not to have their action misunderstood the bishops of Asia and Phrygia had written, among others, the church of Lyons and Vienne not only for their approval but very probably for their good offices in preventing a misunderstanding at Rome, where already in the days of Polycarp a difference of opinion as to some matters of practice had arisen, although, due to the tolerance of Anicetus, matters had turned out amicably, even though it was only a lull before the greater storm.[40] It is furthermore far from impossible that the Montanists had appealed to Rome for support against the local Asian bishops. Whether Eleutherus might have interfered and, in that case, whether his interference would have effected the reversal of the local excommunication, is, of course, uncertain. Such an act could scarcely have avoided causing a deal of unrest between West and East, if not an actual rift. At any rate, there was the very real

[39] H. E. v, 14, 1–19, 4.
[40] See (below) p. 153.

danger that Rome, not knowing all the facts, might be misled since the teachings of Montanus might well seem orthodox enough.

It would appear that the Gallican Christians agreed, and that the purpose of the letter which Eusebius remarks they sent to Eleutherus, apparently by the hand of Irenaeus, "who was at that time already (a?) presbyter of the diocese of Lyons," [41] and in which they highly commended Irenaeus to Eleutherus was to urge him not to interfere, lest peace be imperiled in the church. At any rate, that is apparently what Eleutherus did. Later, as is clear from Tertullian's writing adv. Praxean,[42] once more the issue was raised in Rome, and for a time support was given to the Montanists, perhaps as a result of the activity of Proclus. But there was strong opposition, and Praxeas apparently was instrumental in causing the Roman bishop to cease his support of a movement which his predecessors had refused to sanction. To conclude this digression, it may be remarked that apparently no Montanists appeared in Rome at this time, that Irenaeus personally never seems to have come in contact with them, and that there is no apparent allusion to them or their tenets in his writings. Apparently, so far as he was concerned, it became a closed matter.

Before considering the other problem involved in this action in Lyons and which had to do with Irenaeus' elevation to the office of bishop, we may consider another incident revealing the close contact between the churches of Gaul and the province of Asia.

Some fifteen years later this potential danger of Roman interference in the affairs of the churches of Asia came to a head, and over precisely the point which might have been an issue forty years before when Polycarp and Anicetus had agreed to disagree — the proper date for the celebration of Easter.

In A.D. 189 Victor succeeded Eleutherus as bishop of Rome. One of his first acts was to seek to force the practice of Rome — and, it must be freely granted, of most of the other Christian communities both East and West — upon the churches of Asia Minor. These latter had persisted in following what they fondly insisted

[41] H. E. v, 4, 1. With regard to the meaning of the phrase "(a) presbyter of the diocese of Lyons" see note 63.

[42] Tertullian, adv. Prax. 1.

was the Apostolic fashion — their opponents styled it Jewish — of celebrating the feast of the Saviour's passover on the fourteenth day after the new moon with which Nisan had begun, quite regardless of what day of the week that might chance to be; [43] and, worse than that, of combining it with Easter. The feast of the Lord's passover ended at 3 P.M. on Nisan 14, and immediately the gloom changed to the joyous feast of resurrection. The rest of the Christian world [44] — Eusebius lists such widely separated dioceses as Caesarea, Jerusalem, Rome, Pontus, Gaul Osrhoene, and Corinth [45] — held that the resurrection must be celebrated on Sunday, and that in consequence the crucifixion was to be commemorated on the Friday preceding, whether that fell on Nisan 14 or not. This difference of date had long been annoying. It might well happen that the Asiatic Easter might fall on the Roman Good Friday.

Victor's decision spelled trouble. The Asiatic churches through Polycrates of Ephesus wrote Victor reaffirming their position and buttressing it not only by some pious if unconvincing astrology —

> Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away, for in Asia great luminaries [i.e., στοιχεῖα apparently in the sense "planets"] sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out [var. "raise up"] all the saints [46] —

but by such names as Philip, John, Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, and Melito, and ending with full organ, including the vox humana and tremulo:

> Therefore, brethren, I who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord and conversed with brethren throughout the world, and have studied all holy scripture, am not afraid of threats, for they have said who were greater than I, "It is better to obey God rather than man."

There is no evidence that that pious word of Peter, so useful when other argument fails, has ever had a conciliatory effect. It certainly did not in the case of Victor. Promptly he excommuni-

[43] Hence they were styled *Quartodecimans.*
[44] For occasional exceptions see note 49.
[45] H. E. v, 23, 3 f.
[46] H. E. v, 24, 2.

cated the Asiatic churches on the grounds of heterodoxy. This forthright act aroused much opposition and many letters. Our concern is with the action of Irenaeus. At once he wrote a letter of protest, in part preserved by Eusebius,[47] stressing the fact that there was no uniformity either as to the day or to the length of the fast; that some fasted for one day, others for two, still others for even longer. And this lack of uniformity was primitive. But one group had never tried to discipline the others. Instead harmony had reigned. When Polycarp had visited Rome, he and Victor's predecessor, Anicetus, had differed in practice, but, far from there having been discord, Anicetus had invited Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist. To overthrow so wholesome an attitude of forbearance was to invite disaster. His own practice conformed with that of Rome, that is, was in contrast to that of the Quartodecimans, but he deplored "excommunicating whole churches of God for following a tradition of ancient custom."

Whether, as in former years, the Asiatic churches had appealed to him for support, or whether it was due to his own initiative — did he fear that Rome was becoming too dictatorial? — that he wrote this irenic letter we have no way of knowing. Nor do we know the result. According to Anatolius this letter was effective [48] and caused a reconciliation; but this is uncertain and has been denied. At any rate, a century and a quarter later at the Council of Nicaea the western practice was finally established.[49]

There is thus clear and unmistakable evidence of a close and lasting relationship between the churches of Southern Gaul and Asia, nor is it necessary to assume that it had begun with the arrival of Irenaeus. Rather it is far more likely that it was what had first led him up the Rhone. There is no reason to assume that Irenaeus was in any sense a pioneer missionary in this region. On the contrary, the churches seem to have been long established at the time of the outbreak of persecution in the latter years of

[47] H.E. v, 24, 12–17.

[48] So Tillemont, op. cit., III, p. 48. He cites: "Anat. P. 445, ap. Buch." I have been unable to locate a copy of this latter work (Anatolii Laodicensis episcopi canon paschalis a Bucherio editus in opere de cyclis, Antwerp, 1633).

[49] But even then there was occasional unconformity. In Britain the Asiatic rule was followed, despite the action of Nicaea, and led to the massacre of twelve hundred monks at Bangor, recounted by the Venerable Bede (H.E. ii, 2).

Marcus Aurelius. No information is available as to their establishment. Late tradition, to be sure, suggests some contact with Paul; accordingly some have seen — with what seems to me little probability — in the departure of Crescens to "Galatia" [50] an indication of the early activity of missionaries in European Gaul. Be that as it may, it is not to be forgotten that Paul had early hoped to push into the virgin territory of Spain. Was it due to his prolonged stay in Ephesus that this decision arose? At any rate, we first hear of it immediately after his departure from that Asian centre. Nor is it impossible that all of these seemingly separate details are a part of a common picture.

Contacts between Southern Gaul and the Asian seacoast had been long established. At the beginning of the sixth century (600 B.C. is the traditional date) Greek traders from Phocaea, the northernmost of the famous twelve cities of Ionia and a very near neighbor of Smyrna, had pushed to the west and had established a colony on the Ligurian coast near the mouth of the Rhone, which they called Massalia.[51] Other colonies soon followed: Tauroentium, Olbia, Athenopolis, Antipolis, Nicaea, and Monoecus to the east; and Rhoda and Emporiae to the west. Massalia, or as the Romans later called it Massilia,[52] soon became a trading centre of great importance. From the first the Greek colonists seem to have got on well with the natives. Later occasional difficulties arose, in the course of which, Roman aid was asked and given — with the result that Rome, now aware of the rich possibilities of the land, established centres first at the warm springs, called Aquae Sextiae, to the north of Massilia (122 B.C.) and four years later at Narbo, destined to rival and eventually to outstrip Massilia.

From the first the Greek settlers found themselves in clash with

[50] II Tim. 4:10.

[51] The earliest writer to mention Massalia — he styled it πόλις τῆς Λιγυστικῆς — is Hecataeus. Aristotle, Justin, Plutarch, and Strabo all attest it. The first-century geographer, Scymnos of Chios, sets its founding 120 years before Marathon.

[52] The origin of the name is unknown. The frequent statement that it is Phoenician for "settlement" is baseless. Professor Albright assures me that there is no such word in Phoenician (or Hebrew) and that there is no slightest evidence for an earlier Phoenician colony in this region. Nor is there any connection between *Massalia* and *Massalian* or *Messalian* (the designation of the later fanatical sect of Euchites) which appears to be derived from the Syriac m'ṣălyânâ. This is simply a case of assonance.

Carthage because of the latter's policy of *mare clausum*. Any dream of a thalassocracy was brought to an end in 535 by the Massaliots' Pyrrhic victory over Carthage and her Etruscan allies at Alalia, a port on Corsica, which they had established twenty years before. This disastrous victory cost them their fleet and the island. From then on they seem to have been content with controlling the trade from Britain and Gaul, much of which flowed south through the valley of the Rhone.

In the course of this control of trade in tin, iron, hides, salt meat, wool, cheese, and slaves they served as very efficient middlemen in the spread of Greek civilization among the friendly Gauls, with whom they freely intermarried. That in Caesar's time the Helvetii employed Greek characters [53] is probably to be ascribed in no small part to their activity. Massilia, while still a very important centre of trade, was also reckoned an eminent seat of learning. Students flocked to it, often in preference to Athens and Alexandria. It had never striven to become a great power like Carthage — and in consequence had escaped the latter's fate. It had gradually been eclipsed by its near neighbor, Narbo, but knowing on which side its bread was buttered, had endured this placidly. It was thoroughly cosmopolitan, continuing to use Greek as the *lingua franca*, together with the official Latin and the local Celtic.

As to the early history of Lyons, or, as it was then known, Lugdunum, strategically located two hundred miles north of Massilia, at the junction of the Rhone and Saône, we have little definite information. That the Massaliot traders were at home in the region is certain; that they established any inland colonies in the Rhone valley, while often stated, is most improbable. It has been stated that a group of Greek refugees from the south had been permitted by the native Segurians to settle at the junction of the rivers, and that they had given it the name Lugudunum or Lugdunum, perhaps in the sense *fort* or *hill of Lug*, a native god. At any rate, in 43 B.C. L. Minatius Plancus had brought a Roman colony from the near-by Vienne.[54] Soon it became the largest and most important Gallic town next to Narbo, due to its excellent

[53] Caesar, de Bell. Gall. vi, 14; cf. i, 29; v, 48.
[54] Dio Cassius, Hist. Rom. xlvi, 50, 4 f.

location and the four roads, which Agrippa built, radiating from it to the Rhine, to the western ocean, to Aquitania, and to Narbo and Massilia.[55] Three aqueducts, the longest of them fifty miles in length, supplied it with water. As a consequence of Caesar's Gallic wars it became the capital of all Gaul and, eventually, the centre of the cult of Roma and the emperors. The famous *ara Augusti*, jointly dedicated by all the sixty states of Gaul in 12 B.C.,[56] was the centre of the annual celebration to which delegates flocked for the games and other features. Two years before, Augustus established at Lyons the imperial mint, which remained through his reign the only source of silver and gold coinage for the empire. The *concilium*, established here, and representing all three Gauls (Lugdunensis, Belgica, and Aquitania), and possessed of very distinct power — or at least prestige — was in itself enough to insure the importance of this prosperous city. In A.D. 59 it was destroyed by fire,[57] but was speedily rebuilt by Nero, who granted it four million sesterces.[58] In gratitude this city, almost alone in Gaul, stood loyal to him in the year of dreadful confusion (A.D. 68) [59] and contributed generously to rebuild Rome after her fire.[60] While Irenaeus was bishop, it was burned again, this time by the soldiers of Septimus Severus (A.D. 197).[61]

Not only was it a large and important city of trade; it was a centre of culture. The Romanizing of Gaul had been rapid in the days of Augustus. In all this Lugdunum played an important part. The Latin language and Roman law had both quickly taken root. Nonetheless the contacts with the Greek seacoast to the south had not been obliterated, and here, as in Massilia, Greek was widely used. The religion of Gaul had proved an obstacle to thorough Romanization, but with characteristic common sense

[55] Strabo, Geog. iv, 6, 11.

[56] Strabo, Geog. iv, 3, 2.

[57] Seneca, Ep. Mor. 91.

[58] Tacitus, Ann. xvi, 13. There is a small but annoying difficulty at this point. The fire at Rome took place in A.D. 64. According to Seneca the burning of Lugdunum was in 58/59. Yet Tacitus expressly says: "The emperor alleviated the disaster at Lugdunum by a grant of four million sesterces to repair the town's losses: the same amount which Lugdunum *had previously* offered in aid of the misfortune of the capital." Thus if this "disaster" (*cladem*) is to be identified with the fire, either Seneca's date or Tacitus' chronology must be in error.

[59] Tacitus, Hist. i, 51.

[60] See note 58.

[61] Herodian, Hist. iii, 7, 7.

Rome had not attempted to blot it out. In consequence a mixture of the Gallic and Roman took place. In far-off Paris, on the site of Notre Dame, sculpture has been found showing the blend of the Gallic and Roman elements. Nor is it to be forgotten that in Massilia, from its very first inception, there had been temples of Ephesian Artemis and of Delphian Apollo. Strabo [62] tells the story that in obedience to an oracle a noble Ephesian matron, Aristarche, had gone with the Phocaeans, at the behest of Artemis herself, to establish her worship in the new colony.

As has already been remarked, the story of the advent of Christian teachers in this cosmopolitan city is not known. By the time of Irenaeus the church was well established, as the evidence of the bloody martyrdom of the Gallican confessors makes all too clear. Had they come from Ephesus or Smyrna, as eight centuries before their forbears had done? Was it these early established contacts between the cities of Ionia and the Greek West which had led Paul to dream of Spain and which had led Irenaeus and others up the reaches of the Rhone? We do not know, but it is far from impossible. One thing is very certain. The fate which first led Irenaeus to this city, where he was to work for many years, had been kind to him. It is high time to lay aside the popular notion that the city on the Rhone was a wilderness, peopled by barbarians, and a sad contrast to such a centre as Smyrna or Ephesus. Instead, he found himself in a highly strategic centre such that it might even be said that his lines had fallen into pleasant places.

The persecution which reached the church of Lyons and Vienne and brought only sadness to many brought preferment to Irenaeus. As has already been remarked, the aged Pothinus — he was over ninety — was one of the victims. Irenaeus became his successor. Much dispute has been occasioned by Eusebius' puzzling paragraph following his transcript from the letters of the Gallican martyrs:

> The same martyrs commended also Irenaeus, already at that time (a?) presbyter [63] of the diocese of Lyons, to the afore-mentioned bishop

[62] Geog. iv, 1, 4.

[63] The customary rendering "a presbyter" is actually interpretation rather than translation. The Greek (*πρεσβύτερον ἤδη τότ' ὄντα τῆς ἐν Λουγδούνῳ παροικίας*)

of Rome, giving the man much good testimony, as the words to the following effect show: "Again and always, Father Eleutherus, we wish you greetings in God. We have requested our brother and companion, Irenaeus, to bear this letter to you and we beg you to hold him in esteem, since he is zealous for the covenant of Christ. For had we been of the opinion that rank could confer righteousness in any man, we should have recommended him first of all as being a presbyter of the church, which is his position." [64]

I have already suggested my reason for feeling that the content of this letter was the advice of the local Christians to Eleutherus not to interfere in the matter of the decision of the Asiatic churches to discountenance Montanism. Was it more than that? Was this commendation of Irenaeus for the purpose of his ordination at the hands of the Roman bishop? So some scholars have argued. It would seem to me that a positive answer is impossible. Eusebius' statement is far too sketchy, and decisive data are wanting. Not only do we have no information as to what constituted induction into this office at this time — did it have to be at the hands of another bishop? if so, was there none nearer than in Rome? — but we cannot be sure of the exact chronology. Was Pothinus dead at the time of Irenaeus' departure or has Eusebius telescoped two matters, the answer to the question regarding Montanism and the chronicle of the suffering martyrs? In favor of the fact that Irenaeus had already departed before the full outburst of the persecution is the fact, already mentioned, that he himself escaped mistreatment. But the absence in the letter to Eleutherus, as quoted by Eusebius, of reference to Pothinus is surprising if the latter were still head of the local Christians. Perhaps the simplest explanation is the correct one, namely, that the term "presbyter" as applied to Irenaeus in the letter and repeated by Eusebius is wrongly differentiated from "bishop," and that at the time of the letter Irenaeus had already succeeded Pothinus. No careful reading of Irenaeus can fail to reveal that not infrequently the terms *presbyter* and *bishop* are used indiscriminately of the same men and in the same contexts. Thus he can write:

---

may with equal faithfulness be rendered "presbyter of the diocese of Lyons," precisely as we might say, "at that time Westcott was bishop of Durham."

[64] Eusebius, H.E. v, 4, 1 f.

But again, when we refer them to that tradition which originates from the apostles, and which is preserved by means of the presbyters in the churches, they [sc. the heretics] object to tradition, saying that they themselves are wiser not merely than the presbyters, but even than the apostles, because they have discovered the unadulterated truth.[65]

On the same page he can speak of the apostles having instituted *bishops* in the churches whose successions he can trace in unbroken line, and that thus the faith preached to men comes down to his own day "by means of the successions of the *bishops*." [66] It may be freely conceded that in this latter passage he refers to the church at Rome, "founded and organized by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul," and that he continues with a phrase classic in the eyes of papal Rome:

For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church, on account of its preëminent authority (*propter potentiorem principalitatem*), that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolical tradition has been preserved continuously by those [faithful men] who exist everywhere.[67]

But though succession from the apostles was a matter of life and death for Irenaeus in his attack upon the heretics, whom he dubbed "recent innovators," and though he was convinced that in this church founded by Peter and Paul was to be found the surest warrant of the apostolic faith and tradition, this in no wise implies that the term *bishop*, as opposed to *presbyter*, was to him of consequence, for in his letter to Victor, already quoted above, he can say, "Among these too were the *presbyters* before Soter,

[65] adv. Haer. iii, 2, 2.

[66] adv. Haer. iii, 3, 1 ff.

[67] adv. Haer. iii, 3, 2. It may very well be that these frequently cited words: *Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio*, should be translated: "For it is a matter of necessity that every church, that is, the faithful everywhere, must congregate, on account of its preëminent position, in this church, in which the apostolic tradition has been preserved continuously by those who live everywhere." That is, does Irenaeus here reflect, in part at least, the wide-spread view of antiquity that in Rome, to which all roads led, was of necessity to be found a cross section of all life and thought, even primitive doctrine? This alternative which since Grabe has been frequently suggested, is restated with great persuasion by W. L. Knox in Journal of Theological Studies XLVII (July-October, 1946), pp. 180–184.

who presided over the church which you now govern, I mean Anicetus and Pius and Hyginus and Telesphorus and Xystus." [68] Thus not only can he say, "Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the *presbyters* who are in the church — those whom, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles," [69] but by this casual reference to the "*bishops* and *presbyters* who came from Ephesus and the other cities adjoining" to Miletus to greet Paul [70] he shows that the two words were for him essentially synonymous. And certainly the same inference is borne out by his appeal for support to some illustrious predecessor: "As I have heard from a certain *presbyter*, who had heard it from those who had seen the apostles, and from those who had been their disciples." [71] Unfortunately the identity of this man is unknown, and the many guesses — Polycarp, Papias, Clement, Justin, Pothinus have all been mentioned — are profitless. One thing would appear certain: Irenaeus is not referring to some subordinate. His references to him (or them) are frequent, and always most deferential, as to "one far superior to me." [72] Nor is it at all likely that Irenaeus is choosing his words with scholarly exactness to indicate that the term *bishop* was a later piece of Christian terminology.

Thus it would appear to me far from impossible that when Irenaeus first makes his appearance in the pages of Eusebius he is already established as Pothinus' successor, and that consequently there is no evidence of his earlier novitiate as a supposedly subordinate presbyter as Jerome and most modern scholars have assumed.[73] This does no slightest violence to the passage in Eusebius,[74] but may well give point to the otherwise obscure allusion: The advice which the brethren at Lyons are sending is being conveyed by one for whom no apology is to be made even to Father Eleutherus himself, for he, like his Roman colleague, is a pres-

[68] Eusebius, H.E. v, 24, 14.

[69] adv. Haer. iv, 26, 2. The whole chapter may be read with profit in the light of this usage.

[70] adv. Haer. iii, 14, 2.

[71] adv. Haer. iv, 27, 1.

[72] adv. Haer. i, pref. 2.

[73] "*Irenaeus, Pothini episcopi, qui Lugdunensem in Gallia regebat ecclesiam, presbyter. . . . Postea iam Pothino . . . martyrium coronato in locum eius substituitur*" — Jerome, de Vir. Inlustr. 35.

[74] See (above) p. 157.

byter, that is, a bishop of the church. In conclusion it may be remarked with some probability that by that phrase, "presbyter of the church" (πρεσβύτερον ἐκκλησίας), is meant not "of Lyons," but of what has now come to be regarded as the Christian church; i.e., insofar as he is "presbyter of the diocese of Lyons," he is "a presbyter of the church wherever established."

This responsibility lay heavy upon him; better said, it dominated his life. Upon him, as upon the traditional Timothy, lay the burden of guarding in its pristine state the deposit which had descended from the past, and which he characterized as "the rule of our faith, and the foundation of the building, and the stability of our conversation":

> God, the Father, not made, not material, invisible; one God, the creator of all things: this is the first point of our faith. The second point is: The Word of God, Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, who was manifested to the prophets according to the form of their prophesying and according to the method of the dispensation of the Father: through whom all things were made; who also at the end of the times, to complete and gather up all things, was made man among men, visible and tangible, in order to abolish death and to show forth life and produce a community of union between God and man. And the third point is: The Holy Spirit, through whom the prophets prophesied, and the fathers learned the things of God, and the righteous were led forth into the way of righteousness: and who in the end of the times was poured out in a new way upon mankind in all the earth, renewing man unto God.[75]

I hope in a subsequent essay to consider in some detail his views, well worth study, for they were manifestly far from being his own production — originality is one of the elements one seeks in vain in Irenaeus — but the cross section of thought a little more than half way — both chronologically and theologically speaking — along the road to Nicaea. For the moment this summary must suffice.

The passage which I have just quoted comes from the Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching, a writing mentioned by Eusebius[76] but long lost to subsequent readers. In 1904 a copy of it

[75] Irenaeus, Dem. 6.
[76] H.E. v, 26, 1.

in Armenian translation was found in the Church of the Blessed Virgin at Eriwan in Armenia and was speedily published. This writing, styled by J. Armitage Robinson, who published a convenient English translation with introduction and notes [77] a "*vade mecum* for an intelligent Christian," was written by Irenaeus shortly after the completion of his longer and essentially controversial Against Heresies — that is, ca. A.D. 190 — and summarizes conveniently the views which in the earlier work he had sought to defend against his opponents. The longer work was written during the days of Eleutherus, probably during the years 180–185,[78] and, as has been earlier remarked, was apparently undertaken primarily as an attempt to overthrow the teaching of the "disciples of Ptolemaeus, whose school may be described as a bud from that of Valentinus," [79] and thus especially noxious in the eyes of the bishop of Lyons. Although it may be safely styled one of the most important of all the early Christian productions — it is still by far the most full and (on the whole) most restrained discussion of second-century Gnosticism, and, by indirection, of the views of the orthodox — and was widely used in antiquity, we have no copy of the Greek original which is said to have been still extant in the sixteenth century. Large sections of the first book and occasional fragments from the others have been recovered from the pages of Hippolytus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, all of whom in the fashion of antiquity quoted extensively wherever their fancy dictated. We have substantially the whole text [80] in a Latin translation, apparently current in the days of Tertullian. It is painfully literal; so literal, in fact, that at times the only way to understand it is to retranslate into Greek. In addition we have numerous Syriac fragments, often in duplicate and triplicate, which fact led Harvey to assume

[77] St. Irenaeus: The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching (London, 1920).

[78] Obviously the persecution of A.D. 177 is well in the past; on the other hand, Theodotion's translation of the O.T. is known to Irenaeus (adv. Haer. iii, 21, 1). For a full discussion of the date of Theodotion's translation and the erroneous interpretation of Epiphanius at this point, see Lipsius' discussion in his article "Irenaeus," in Dict. Christian Biog. III, pp. 258 f.

[79] adv. Haer. i, pref. 2.

[80] It is not unlikely that the present end (v, 36, 3) was not the original conclusion, but that some part has been lost. The absence of any sort of summary to the whole writing is surprising.

that a complete Syriac version was also made. The same manuscript which contained the hitherto unknown Demonstration contains Book IV and V of the larger work — of course in Armenian.

Obviously Irenaeus used sources. No human brain could carry all the endless vagaries which he so studiously and conscientiously sets forth. Occasionally he refers to the writings of the heretics themselves in such a way as to indicate that he knew them at first hand. Thus he mentions specifically having read the Commentaries of Valentinus [81] and of having made a collection of the writings of the Cainites.[82] It is also highly probable that he made use of some earlier Christian refutations, as the lost Syntagma of Justin — his dependence upon Justin is scarcely open to question. Once he quotes eight metrical verses which had been composed against Marcus by one whom he labels "that divine elder and preacher of the truth." [83] In what are now the final pages of the work [84] — omitted by several of the manuscripts apparently because scribes of the Middle Ages disapproved of their lusty chiliasm — he quotes extensively from the fourth book of Papias' lost Interpretations of the Oracles of the Lord, to the obvious annoyance of Eusebius who styled Papias "a man of very little intelligence, as is clear from his books" and held him responsible for the fact that so many subsequent Christian writers, as Irenaeus, shared his chiliastic views, relying upon his antiquity.[85] As has already been suggested, Irenaeus made constant reference to the elders before him, although it is quite impossible to identify the ones he means or to determine whether at times he possesses their writings. Although it is usually said that there is no trace of his use of anything from the writings of Polycarp, the words, "Now the love of God is far from all sin," [86] are strongly reminiscent, as Rendel Harris long ago pointed out, of Polycarp's "For he who has love is far from all sin." [87] Finally it may be remarked that it is scarcely to be doubted that he made use of the lost Memoirs of Hegesippus. In fact, it is not impossible that he was heavily dependent upon the latter who was

[81] adv. Haer. i, pref. 2.
[82] adv. Haer. i, 31, 2.
[83] adv. Haer. i, 15, 6.
[84] adv. Haer. v, 32–36.
[85] H.E. iii, 39, 13.
[86] Dem. 95.
[87] Polycarp, ad Philip. 3:3.

so manifestly concerned, as Eusebius records, about uniformity of doctrine, or, as he himself phrased it, "the true word" (τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ), that he traveled as far as Rome, mingling with the various bishops, listening to their conversations, and taking sedulous notes.[88]

In addition to the Against Heresies and the Demonstration he wrote a lengthy epistle to Florinus who had been a friend of his — or, at least, an acquaintance — back in Smyrna and who was now a member of the presbytery at Rome.[89] Apparently Florinus had argued that to believe in the unity of the Deity required one to view him as the author of evil. Irenaeus' tract seems to have convinced Florinus; in consequence he became a Valentinian! That produced another tract, On the Ogdoad, also known to us only from a fragment. Obviously Irenaeus thought highly of this writing. Eusebius records that he concluded it with the words:

> I adjure thee, who shalt copy out this book, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by his glorious advent when he comes to judge the quick and the dead, that thou compare what thou shalt transcribe and correct it with this copy whence thou art transcribing, with all care; and thou shalt likewise transcribe this oath and put it in the copy.[90]

We have fragments, too, of a tract against Blastus, an Alexandrian, if the description in a Syriac fragment of the treatise entitled On Schism is to be trusted.[91] Blastus had apparently sided with the Asiatics in the Paschal controversy. Other fragments, too, are known — one in Syriac purports to be On the Lord's Resurrection,[92] another from the Concerning Knowledge to which Eusebius makes passing reference.[93]

With this reference to his literary activity — almost exclusively devoted to keeping uncontaminated the springs of truth — we must leave him for the present. That he was an honest man and a conscientious one cannot be gainsaid. Perhaps his name

[88] H.E. iv, 22, 1 ff.
[89] H.E. v, 15, 1.
[90] H.E. v, 20, 2.
[91] This is printed by Harvey as Syriac Fgm. XXVII (op. cit., II, p. 456).
[92] The Armenian heading so describes the fragment. Harvey (op. cit., II, p. 460) suggests that this otherwise unknown treatise may be the same as On the Passover.
[93] H.E. v, 26.

Irenaeus — *man of peace* — is apt; it has often been so stated, and it may be said without qualification that none of the rancor or bitterness of a Tertullian or the unconsecrated malignancy of an Epiphanius is to be found in him. On the other hand, there seems little of the passionate indignation that flamed forth from a Justin, aflame at the outrageous treatment which innocent men were receiving and that dared the imperial thunderbolts. Undoubtedly the circumstances were not the same. As has been indicated, there is no apparent trace of persecution reflected in his writings. Yet it cannot be denied that he seems to have been shielded in some sort of way from the blast that ravaged his church in 177, and, more than that, it never seems to have occurred to him to buckle on his sword to do battle against the perpetrators. Rather his interest seems manifestly to have been to fight against those whose weapons were, as he might have phrased it, levelled not against the body but against the soul. Each to his own taste; perhaps the answer may be found, in part at least, in the fact that throughout the period we know him he was Irenaeus *bishop* of Lyons.

GREEK MYSTERIES IN THE CONFESSION OF ST. CYPRIAN

MARTIN P. NILSSON
LUND UNIVERSITY

PRECISELY a hundred years ago Preller called attention to a curious passage in the Confession of St. Cyprian describing certain Greek mysteries and printed the text adding a few brief notes.[1] This Cyprian was a famous magician who was converted to Christianity, the prototype of Dr. Faust, and is often confused with his namesake, the bishop of Carthage. His legend became very popular, there are Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic versions, and it has been much discussed.[2] The Confession, so called because in it Cyprian speaks in his own words, was originally independent and later, but before Eudocia's metaphrasis, was inserted between the first book, the Conversion, and the third book, the Martyrdom, of the Greek version. The Empress Eudocia who married Theodosius II in A.D. 421 put the legend into verse, presumably in her old age; she included the Confession,[3] which also was known to Gregory Nazianzen who in A.D. 379 delivered a sermon on St. Cyprian.[4] This is valuable because it determines the time in which the Confession was composed, somewhat before A.D. 379. Thus it is roughly contemporary with the Neoplatonic circle of the Emperor Julian and was written at a time when paganism was still a living reality, a fact which adds to the importance of the passage. The anonymous author shows a sound acquaintance with curious and recondite Greek religious lore. His description of the mysteries is worthy of greater attention

[1] L. Preller, Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums, Philologus, I, 1846. p. 349 ff.

[2] Th. Zahn, Cyprian von Antiochien, 1882, is fundamental. Bibliography in A. J. Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I, 1944, p. 369 ff. The paper which Festugière was not able to consult, V. Ryssel, Der Urtext der Cyprianlegende, Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, CX, 1903, p. 273 ff., contains translations of Syriac and Arabic texts.

[3] Eudociae Augustae etc. carminum graecorum reliquiae, ed. A. Ludwich, 1897; Migne, Patrologia graeca, vol. 85, p. 846 ff.

[4] Orat. XXIV, 8–12 in Migne, Patrologia, vol. 65, p. 1169 ff.

than is accorded to it, for even though of course it is fictitious, it is founded on the knowledge and the ideas of the fourth century A.D.

The passage [5] runs: "I am Cyprian who since my tender childhood was devoted to Apollo as a precious gift and still as an infant initiated in the dramatic performance of the dragon (*τὴν τοῦ δράκοντος δραματουργίαν*). I was not yet seven years old when I went to the mysteries of Mithras, and being a stranger in Athens, but through the zeal of my parents having become a citizen, at the age of ten years I bore the torches (*ἐδᾳδούχησα*) for Demeter and submitted to the white sorrow of Kore,[6] and I served (*ἐλειτούργησα*) the snake of Pallas on the Acropolis, having been promoted to the dignity of a temple servant (*εἰς προκοπὴν νεωκόρου καταστάς*). I came also to Mt. Olympus which is said to be the dwelling place of the gods and I was initiated in sounds of converse and in the recounting of noises (*ἠχοῦς ὁμιλιῶν* [— *ίαν* corr. Preller] *καὶ ψόφων διήγησιν*). I saw there trees performing miracles (*φαντάζοντα πρέμνα*) and herbs which appeared to be active under divine overruling.[7] I saw there the succession of seasons under the change of the winds and the variation of days caused by opposing energies. I saw there bands of daemones singing hymns, others at war, others in ambush, deceiving, casting into confusion, I beheld there the phalanx of every god and goddess, waiting there forty days. Here is the palace, as it were, from which they send forth the winds, for each to do its work on earth and among all nations. My only meal was one of nuts after sunset. Being fifteen years of age I was there initiated by the seven hierophants in the energies of each of them, for my parents were very eager that I should know the secrets of earth and air and sea, not only what relates to the natural growth and death of plants and trees

[5] The text is printed by Preller l. c. and in Acta Sanctorum, Septemb. vol. VII, 1760, p. 222 ff.; p. 204 ff. in the edition of 1867 which I have used; for textual criticism see the footnotes of Festugière, l. c. p. 38 f. In the section describing the mysteries on Mt. Olympus I take over the translation of Nock, Cyprian of Antioch, Journal of Theological Studies, XXVIII, 1927, p. 411 ff.

[6] I add the corresponding verse of Eudocia's metaphrasis, because it follows the original pretty closely and shows how she understood its words. Eudocia, II, v. 19, *Δηοῖ δᾷδας ἀνῆψα, Κόρης δ' ἀργεννὸν ὑπέστην πένθος.*

[7] Eudocia, II, v. 24, *ἔνθα τινῶν ἐπέων ἦχον καὶ δοῦπον ἄκουον, λεῦσα πόας πρέμνους τε ὅσον θαμβῆσα ὀπωπήν.*

and bodies, but also the energies imprinted on all of them by the Lord of this Age (*ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος*) in opposition to the moulding of God. I came also to Argos at the time of the mysteries of Hera [8] and was there initiated in the counsels of the unity of air with ether and of ether with air and likewise of earth with water and water with air. I came also to Elis and came to know Artemis Tauropolos in Lacedaemon in order to learn the blending and dividing of matter and the lifting up of oblique and savage narratives (*μετεωρισμοὺς λοξῶν καὶ ἀγρίων διηγήσεων*).[9] And what belongs to *manlike* divination I apprehended from the Phrygians and I learned how to inspect the liver and among barbarians I learned divination from birds and the contortions of four-footed animals and the observation of sounds of those good at knowing (*γνωστικῶν κληδονισμούς*),[10] and the shrill cries of each wood and stone and the sounds of the dead in the graves and the noise of doors and the palpitation of limbs, I learned to know also the motion of the blood (*αἱμάτων φοράς*) in bodies according to its energy, and the compositions and extension of warts (*μυρμηκισμῶν συστάσεις καὶ ἀνατάσεις*),[11] and the throwing of words and numbers into words and of words into numbers, and the superficial effects of disease on the bodies as though natural and the natural as though feigned, and oaths which are heard and not heard and agreements in hostility. Nothing on the earth nor in the sea nor in the air was hidden from me, neither in the way of apparitions (*φασματικόν*) nor in the way of knowledge (*γνωστικόν*); no changeful things (*πολύτροπον*), no mechanical, no artificial things (*οὐ μηχανικὸν οὐκ ἔντεχνον*), not even legerdemain with the text of Scripture (*τῆς τῶν γραφῶν μεταφορᾶς μαγγανικῆς*) and all such things").[12]

I have translated the passage at length, including what is said

[8] Eudocia, II, v. 53, *ἣν δὲ Τιθωνιάδος ἔροτις λευχείμονος* 'Ηοῦς. Eudocia read 'Ηοῦς instead of Ἥρας, but this cannot be right.

[9] Eudocia, II, v. 59, *ἐν Σπάρτῃ ἔσιδον βρέτας ὄβριμον ὄφρα δαείην ὑλομενῆ, πολύμορφον ἄγαν φύσιν ἠδὲ μεταλλάξ, ψήφους τε γραφίδας τε χαρακτῆρας δέ τι κόσμου γραιώδεις μύθους τε κτλ.* Here Eudocia has put in something of her own.

[10] Eudocia, II, v. 67, *κληδόνας ἀιζηῶν τοί κεν τὰ ἔπειθ' ὁρόωσι.*

[11] Eudocia, II, v. 71, *ὄγκους αἱματόεντας ὅσοι μέλεα χραίνουσίν, εὖτε δὲ μυρμήκων βρώμη κατὰ ἄψεα βαίνει.*

[12] Eudocia, II, v. 80, *εἴως ἠπιδανοῦς ἀπάτης καὶ αἰσυλοεργῶν.* Sense doubtful, see Festugière, l. c. p. 39, n. 3.

of *manlike*. This does not belong to the mysteries, but it is characteristic of the state of mind of the age. It enumerates all kinds of *manlike* divination save for the ecstatic. A commentary, which ought to be a treatise on the *manlike* of Late Antiquity, is superfluous. Equally characteristic is the great attention paid to medicine. It brings to mind the famous letter of the doctor Thessalus,[13] but still more pertinent is the fact that a gnostic treatise, the Μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, described by Hippolytus[14] and ascribed to Simon Magus, shows a considerable knowledge of medicine. It was one of the occult sciences of the age and connected with magic and religion.

We turn to the alleged mysteries. Preller recognized that the δραματουργία τοῦ δράκοντος refers to the ceremony called Stepterion which is described by Plutarch at some length.[15] It would be superfluous to discuss here the very obscure problem of this rite, but it is sufficient to state that, according to Plutarch and Strabo, it was interpreted as the killing of the dragon Python by Apollon.[16]

The word ἐδᾳδούχησα cannot be understood in the technical sense "to be the priest called daduchos" but in the broader sense "to bear torches" as did the mystae. Nock has rightly explained the λευκὸν πέπλος as referring to the white garments of the celebrants and the snake of Pallas as the οἰκουρὸς ὄφις[17] which, according to Herodotus, VIII, 41, left its abode in her temple when the Persians approached, as the Athenians believed, because the honeycake offered to it monthly was left untouched. The snake was the holy animal of Athena, it lurked beneath her shield even in the statue of Phidias. One may also recall the myth of the infant Erichthonios whom the daughters of Cecrops received hidden in a chest. When, disobeying the goddess, they

[13] Translated by Festugière l. c. p. 56 f.; idem., Revue biblique, XLVIII, 1939, p. 45 ff.; Cumont, Revue philologique, XLII, 1918, p. 85 f.; Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen, 3rd ed., p. 127 f.; Diller s. v. in Pauly-Wissowa.

[14] Hippolyt, refutatio haereseon, VI, 9–18.

[15] Plutarch, quaest. graecae, 12, p. 293 C, and de def. orac., p. 418 A; briefly Strabo, VIII, p. 422.

[16] My Griechische Feste, p. 150 ff.; W. R. Halliday, The Greek Questions of Plutarch, p. 67 f.

[17] This expression Aristophanes, Lysistrata, v. 758 f.; Photius and Hesych s. v. from Phylarchus.

opened the chest they found the child encircled by snakes or, instead of the child, a snake.[18]

The two snake-cults are not mysteries, of course, for all quaint rites were called mysteries in this age, but these two are selected not without purpose. Snake-cult was common in paganism and the snake was in this age a well-known symbol of recurring time. The snake had an extremely prominent place in Christian doctrine. The gnostic sect of the Ophites glorified and venerated the snake, but to Christians in general the snake was the old fiend, a symbol of the arch-enemy. The anonymous author stressed these two snake-cults in order to emphasize the horrors of paganism. The mysteries of Mithras and of Eleusis were a matter of course, the best known at this time.

Much more difficult problems are raised by the alleged mysteries on Mt. Olympus. Such mysteries never existed; the problem is why the anonymous writer invented them and where he found the details of his fictitious description. Nock points to the affinity with certain ideas recurring in the Hermetic writings, which is undeniable and I agree with his conclusion that this revelation is essentially of a theosophic kind and that its localization on Mt. Olympus is not due to older worship on the spot, but I think that we have to cast our nets wider. The program of Hermetism was: "I want to learn to know that which is and its nature, to know God" (I, 3), and this was, generally speaking, the program of the theosophy of late paganism and it found its way into the mysteries too.

I confess with Nock that I do not quite understand the words ἠχοῦς ὁμιλιῶν (ὁμιλίαν corr. Preller) καὶ ψόφων διήγησιν; they ought to be referred to the interpretation of certain sounds, imparted at the initiation. The following sentence refers to trees and herbs to which the gods have given miraculous power.[19] Then we encounter the time-honored idea of the mountain top as the seat of the weather-god embellished with modern speculations. The regular change of the seasons is an old common place of the

[18] The scene is figured on a vase, see Roscher's Lexikon der Mythologie, I, p. 1307.

[19] Nock's translation seems to be doubtful. φαντάζειν can hardly signify 'to work miracles,' the common significance is 'to make visible,' present to the eye or to the mind. Eudocia's metaphrasis is: II, v. 25, ὅσον θαμβῆσαι ὀπωπήν.

praise of divine government and the Horae in Homer appear on Olympus. The winds are again mentioned a few lines below where they are said to be sent out over the world as from a palace. The winds have an important place in the religious cosmology of Late Antiquity, e.g., in the magic papyri. A prayer to the Highest God begins: "Come to me, thou from the four winds, almighty God, etc." In the so-called Mithras liturgy the ascension of the magician to the heavens is described: "he will see the constellation of that day and that hour, some ruling gods going up in the heavens, others going down; the road of the visible gods will be seen through the disc, my Father, the God, and likewise the so-called pipe, the origin of the wind which does service; you will see something like a pipe hanging down from the disc." [20] The words *ἡμερῶν διαφορότητι ὑπό τινων ἐνεργειῶν ἐναντίων συνισταμένων* [21] are spoken so generally that it is difficult to catch the precise sense, but probably astrological ideas underlie them.

The following sentence describes the hosts of the gods in action. Except for the hymns the actions mentioned are such as long since were collected from the tales of mythology in order to punish the immorality of the old gods, war, ambush, trickery, confusion, and so on. It is plain that the author is concerned to prove how despicable the pagan gods are. The problem is where he got the idea of having the gods show their vices in action. It may be from the mythological performances, which sometimes were called Bacchic mysteries [22] and were popular especially in Asia Minor. Lucian describes them: [23] at the appointed time people forget everything and sit whole days seeing Titans and Corybants and Satyrs and Bucoli dancing, and Philostratus says of Athens [24] that they dance with many contortions (*λυγισμούς*) to tunes of the flute, and in the midst of the poems and the theology of Orpheus some act as Horae, others as Nymphs, and others as Bacchants. These dances were not simple ballets, we find them

[20] Pap. gr. mag., XII, l. 238, and IV, l. 545 f. resp.

[21] Eudocia, II, v. 28, *αὕτως δ' ἤματα πολλά, τά πέρ τινες ἔνδον ἀνιγροὶ φαντασίην τεύχοντες ἀπηνέες ἀντιπάλαμνοι, (τεύχουσι* corr. Ludwich).

[22] Here I cannot enter upon this topic, it will be expounded in the second volume of my Geschichte der griechischen Religion.

[23] Lucian, de saltatione, 79.

[24] Philostratus, vita Apollonii, IV, 21.

related to the theology of late paganism. In the guild of the Iobacchi some persons took the part of gods.[25] This is one reason why such performances were called mysteries. In the performance the battles, ambushes and trickeries of the gods could be represented.

The author took the old idea of Mt. Olympus as the seat of the gods as an appropriate opportunity for a comprehensive picture of their wickedness. In their own abode he was able to show them in action and borrowed the colors of his description from the mythological performances of his time which were sometimes interpreted in a mystical sense. The role of Mt. Olympus as the seat of the gods ruling the celestial phenomena was a stimulus for the addition of cosmological and perhaps astrological speculations current at that time. The importance of astrology is emphasized in the following sentence, in which Cyprian says that he was initiated by the seven hierophants in the energies in each of them. For the seven hierophants are no doubt the seven celestial bodies which by their energies rule the life of earth and man and reveal his fate. In the following sentence there is an unmistakable reference to the energies implanted in earthly things according to astrological doctrine.

It should be noted that the assertion that his only meal was acorns after sunset is intended to convey the ascetic mode of life which was appropriate to a pupil of the secret arts and doctrines,[26] but the *ἀκρόδρυα* are taken from Greek tradition. Acorns are said to be the oldest nourishment of man and a token of the old simplicity; Demeter taught man the use of cereals, but till then his sole nourishment was nuts.[27]

Our author goes over to the occult sciences or what may be called the natural philosophy of Late Antiquity, which had a very important place in magic as well as in religion. What he says about energies imprinted on herbs, trees, and bodies is very characteris-

[25] Dittenberger, Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum, 3rd ed., 1109, l. 121 f. as compared with l. 65 f.; cf. the mystic interpretation of the hymn to Attis sung in the theatre, Hippolyt, refutatio haereseon, V, 9.

[26] See Festugière, l. c. p. 39 n. 1.

[27] Plin., Nat. hist., VII, 191; Virg., Georg., I, v. 7 f. et 147 f.; it is a commonplace and there are proverbs referring to the custom. The instances are collected by T. Segerstedt, Ekguden i Dodona, Lund universitets Årsskrift, N.F., Afd. I, Vol. I, No. 1, 1906, p. 32 f.

tic, for it reflects the doctrine of occult energy which pervaded the thinking of the age.

This doctrine is illustrated by the initiations of Hera in Argos. We may remember that Argos signifies the province as well as the city. This description is important because these mysteries seem to be real. According to Pausanias [28] the Argives said that Hera bathed yearly in the fountain Kanathos at Nauplia and thereby regained her virginity; this is a secret tale, he adds, derived from the initiation which they celebrate in honor of Hera. Certainly these mysteries included the sacred marriage of Hera. The myth that Zeus in the shape of a cuckoo deceived Hera and won her love was localized on Mt. Kokkygion in Argos and the statue of Hera by Polycletus in the Heraeum had a cuckoo on the top of her sceptre.[29] It has been surmised that the great festival celebrated at the Heraeum represented the sacred marriage, though this is very uncertain,[30] but the fact that they used the water of the river Eleutherion near the Heraeum for secret sacrifices [31] is reminiscent of the bath of Hera at Nauplia. Our knowledge is scanty, we know only that there were mysteries of Hera in Argos and that the myth of the sacred marriage was localized there, but this is sufficient. It may perhaps be added that there were more mysteries in Argos and its neighborhood than in any other province in Late Antiquity. The mysteries at Lerna were famous, Epidaurus was very nearly related to Eleusis, Hecate had mysteries on Aegina and Libanius speaks of mysteries of Poseidon on the Isthmus.[32]

The contents of the mysteries of Hera were according to our author the unity of air with aether and of aether with air and likewise of earth with water and of water with air. One is reminded of the philosophy of Heraclitus, according to which the elements were transmuted one into the other. Such an interpretation was very suitable to the sacred marriage of Zeus and Hera, for Hera was interpreted by Plato [33] and then by the Stoics as air.

[28] Paus., II, 38, 2.
[29] Paus., II, 36, 2 and 17, 4 resp.; Schol. Theocr., XV v. 64.
[30] See my Griech. Feste, p. 44 f.; more positive is A. B. Cook, Zeus, III, p. 1043 f.
[31] Paus., II, 17, 1.
[32] Libanius, XIV, 5, p. 426 Reiske.
[33] Plato, Cratylus, p. 404 C.

Juno between the sun-god and the moon-goddess on the Jupiter column at Mainz is certainly to be understood as the air.[34] For the relation of Zeus to the aether I need only refer to Cook's great work.[35] The marriage of Zeus and Hera was very aptly interpreted as the union of aether and air. The union of the earth with the water is an old conception which Aeschylus expounded magnificently [36] and I may also adduce a fragment of Euripides [37] in which the Aether of Zeus is called the begetter of men and gods and Earth the mother of all. Such ideas were not foreign to Late Antiquity, although they were reinterpreted under the influence of philosophical doctrines.

It seems that Argive mysteries including the sacred marriage of Hera existed. The physical interpretation of the myth was obvious and as a matter of course applied to these mysteries. If this is so, it is important, for it reveals to us the nature of the doctrines imparted to the celebrants of the mysteries. Modern scholars speak of immortality and divinization, but the allegorical and cosmological interpretations are more in accordance with ancient thought. There are hints pointing in such a direction, but in this case there seems to be evidence. On the whole the mysteries of Late Antiquity have been neglected, but this topic is too vast to be taken up here. I shall return to it in the forthcoming second volume of my History of Greek Religion.

Our author says nothing of Elis, the Olympian games were being celebrated, though for the last time in A.D. 393, and their fame caused a mention of Elis, but they had nothing to offer for the purpose of our author. The last cult mentioned is that of Artemis Tauropolos at Sparta. The Tauropolos is the most famous Artemis cult of Sparta that of Artemis Orthia, for her xoanon was said to be that of Artemis Tauropolos which Orestes brought from Tauris.[38] This goddess was also called λυγοδέσμα, because her xoanon was found in a shrub of withy wound round with twigs which held it upright.[39] Thus we may understand our

[34] Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, XXIII, 1925, p. 180.
[35] A. B. Cook, Zeus, I, p. 25 f.
[36] Aeschylus in the Dnaides, fr. 195 Nauck 2nd ed.; cf. my Geschichte der griechischen Religion, I, p. 431 f.
[37] Euripides in Chrysippos, fr. 839 Nauck 2nd ed.
[38] Paus., III, 16, 7.
[39] Paus., III, 16, 11.

author's bold explanation that he wanted to know the blending and dividing of matter (*ὕλης σύγχυσιν καὶ διαίρεσιν*); *ὕλη* signifying wood and matter. I confess that I do not quite understand the following words: *μετεωρισμοὺς λοξῶν καὶ ἀγρίων διηγήσεων*, nor did Eudocia. The sense is perhaps "the overdoing of enigmatical and barbaric myths," such as that of Artemis Tauropolos, and if this is so, it is a stricture on such myths and their allegorical interpretation.

In the following section Cyprian relates his experiences in Egypt and Babylonia. This section contains many strange things, in Egypt he learned to know physical and mythical lore and personifications of vices, in Babylonia astrology. He concludes with a description of the devil in his retinue. An analysis of this section by a scholar who has a wide knowledge of occult literature would be interesting, but as it does not pertain to the mysteries I pass over it. My aim was an attempt to analyze Cyprian's description of the mysteries and to compare it with our knowledge derived from other sources in order to find out what light it might throw on the mysteries of late paganism.

EARLY QUAKERISM AND UNCANONICAL LORE

HENRY J. CADBURY
Harvard University

The attitude of the Society of Friends to the Bible is a chapter of Quaker history that has yet to be written. Among biographical features it would include the names of several Quaker scholars — including Robert Barclay (1648–1690), the apologist, Anthony Purver (1702–1777), who singlehanded made a complete translation of the Bible, S. P. Tregelles (1813–1875), the textual critic, though he joined later other denominations, Thomas Chase (1827–1892), President of Haverford College and a member of the American Bible Revision Committee, and, not the least, the versatile and venerable Rendel Harris (1852–1941).

The present essay is animated by no ambition to fill the lacuna mentioned above. Its more modest intention is to call attention to fields of learning and literature just beyond the confines of the Old and New Testament, and to the question how and how far in the Seventeenth Century they influenced the Society of Friends.

Behind the problem as it affects early Quakerism is the more general problem of the same influences in the surrounding English life. Many aspects of Quakerism were not individual, but were part and parcel of the "culture" of the time. The extensive knowledge and use of the English Bible was not a peculiarity of Friends. It was all but universal. As a familiar historian has said:

> No greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years which parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament. England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible. It was as yet the one English book which was familiar to every Englishman; it was read at churches and read at home, and everywhere its words, as they fell on ears which custom had not deadened, kindled a startling enthusiasm.[1]

It was at this time and in this environment that the founders of Quakerism were growing up. George Fox's friends believed "that

[1] J. R. Green, Short History of the English People, chap. viii. Sec. 1. Cf. his England, Book VII, chap. 1.

though the Bible were lost it might be found in the mouth of George Fox." [2] Bunyan, his contemporary, is also said to have known the Bible almost by heart. For twelve years in Bedford jail his only library consisted of a Bible and one other book.[3] No doubt many another uneducated preacher and writer of the day had that best of all single cultures, — the Bible in one's own tongue. Whether Quakers or not they were persons *unius libri.*

This intensive interest in the Bible not only limited the other reading of many men of the day: it determined the direction that any additional reading should follow. Scholarship turned to theology, theology to the study of the Bible. We are acquainted with some of the efforts made by Fox to understand the original languages of the Bible itself, and with the tools and friends available to him for this purpose. It is natural that even men of the least culture should compare English translations with each other and with the original, should own translations in other modern tongues and should aspire to meet the learned in argument by a halting and secondhand acquaintance with Latin and Greek. All this Fox occasionally did, while more educated men of his circle brought to bear for the cause of "Truth" the very theological training of that "hireling" profession which they had themselves renounced.

Next to the Bible, to Biblical helps and to the controversial writings of themselves and their opponents, the Bible readers of the seventeenth century with their religious interest naturally turned to older books that were of nearly canonical interest. So far as the physical and linguistic accessibility of these books permitted, the same material would be read with the same interest by Friends. Without more knowledge than we now possess of the general currency of such works it is difficult to know whether the Quaker interest in literature of this kind was particularly keen. From our modern viewpoint it would seem as though Friends in their ignorance had a characteristic credulity for the apocryphal and occult. This essay will no doubt give a false

[2] G. Croese, The General History of the Quakers, 1696, p. 14.

[3] According to Charles Doe, his first biographer, the other book was Foxe's Book of Martyrs: "I surveyed his library, the least and yet the best that I ever saw, consisting only of two books." But Bunyan himself writes, "My Bible and my Concordance are my only library in my writings."

impression by its self-imposed limitation. We are dealing here with certain books and certain readers only, while of course other books than the extra-canonical and other readers than Friends must be considered if one is to gain a comparative picture.

Toward the Old Testament Apocrypha the early Friends inherited a mixed tradition. There was every reason why they should be familiar with its contents, since it was generally included in the printed Bibles of the age,[4] yet its authority was hotly contested. There were differences of position among the English churches. The Council of Trent (1546) had committed the Roman church to a definite expression of equal veneration for the apocrypha as for the other books, thereby reversing both the judgment of the Fathers about their relative merits and the preceding policy of the Church in not making the limits of the contents of the Bible an absolute article of faith. It decreed: "If . . . anyone does not receive the entire books with all their parts as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church and in the old Latin Vulgate edition as sacred and canonical . . . let him be Anathema." The Church of England gave to the Apocrypha a subordinate position. This is shown successively both in the translations and in the articles of faith. The final form of the latter (The Thirty-nine Articles, 1571, Art. vi) says of the Apocrypha: "And the other books (as Jerome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine."

The Puritans, however, gave to the Apocrypha a place still lower. They vehemently protested against its ecclesiastical use. No doubt it savored to them of Papacy. In the ejection of dissenting ministers following the Act of Uniformity in 1661 this objection played an important rôle. Calamy explains their objection as follows: [5]

[4] In course of time the Puritan aversion to the Apocrypha was expressed by editions in which it was omitted. The British and Foreign Bible Society has copies bound without Apocrypha as early as 1599 (Geneva) or 1629 (A.V.). Such a copy of the King James Bible printed in 1698 was owned by William Penn and is preserved in the Pennsylvania Historical Society.

[5] The Non Conformist's Memorial, etc. by Edmund Calamy, ed. by Samuel Palmer, London, 1775, I. p. 42.

The use of the Apocrypha in the lections is attacked in Henry Hickman, Apologia pro Ministris in Anglia (vulgo) Non-Conformistis, 1664, and defended in

They could not consent to read the apocryphal lessons, which they found appointed to be read wholly and intirely, morning and evening for two months together, under the title of Holy Scripture, while in the same order (as appears by the Kalendar) some books of the sacred canon are wholly left out, some of them read but in part, and many of them mutilated and curtailed . . . They especially objected to the stories of *Tobit* and his dog, Bel and the dragon, Judith and Baruch, &c. which they found the most celebrated bishops and doctors of the church owning to be false and fictitious. . . .

With such a position the Friends might well sympathize, though they were, of course, not affected in their own worship by the calendar of lessons.[6] Insofar as the Apocrypha were regarded as typically Papist, Friends, as the extreme of Protestants, might be expected to slight them. Nathaniel Ward in The Simple Cobbler of Aggawam in America in 1647 mentioned first among the things "my heart hath naturally detested . . . the standing of the Apocrypha in the Bible." From an unexpected source we get evidence of the Quaker rejection of the apocrypha. Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, imprisoned by the Inquisition in the Island of Malta during the 1660's

took occasion at this time to ask the Friars for their Bibles which they had taken from them, but one of the Friars told them they should never see them again, they were false. Katharine asked wherein they were false, saying, That however they had no warrant from the Lord to take them from 'em. The Friar told her, that Maccabees were not in them. She reply'd, If any were taken from them yet the rest might be pure; but if any were added to them, then they were corrupted.[7]

Conversely when the Quakers cited from the Apocrypha some Protestants in England felt confirmed in suspecting they were

---

William Falkner, Libertas Ecclesiastica, 1674, William Clagett, An Answer to Dissenters' Objections against the Common Prayers, 1683. The objection to the Apocrypha is voiced also by John Canne, the separatist, in 1634, in his A Necessitie of Separation from the Church of England, pp. 108f., one of the books owned by George Fox. See note 35.

[6] At the last conference in the Jerusalem Chamber in 1689 one of the Puritan proposals was the omission from the calendar of all lessons from the Apocrypha See B. F. Westcott, The Bible in the Church, edit. of 1901, p. 291.

[7] A Brief History of the Voyage of Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers to the Island of Malta, 1715, pp. 56f.

Papists.[8] Their writings show almost no tendency to use the Apocrypha for proof-texts, and indeed very little acquaintance with its contents.[9] It may well be doubted of George Fox whether much of the Apocrypha could have been "found in his mouth." To know the title Bel and the Dragon and to use it reproachfully is no real exception. Once we read

But the Lord doth own his own seed, and is the Teacher of his people to walk humbly before him, and hath given them a light that they see Babel and Bel, and the Dragon and Babylon.[10]

Elsewhere he starts off:

The young Bell and Dragon worse than the Old. The young Bell and Dragon he eateth up more in every temple in every parish. . . .[11]

The index to scripture citations in his Journal includes none from the Apocrypha, and in his famous epistle on women's meetings the list of good women [12] passes directly from the Old Testament to the New.[13] In like manner when Thomas Ellwood prepared

[8] A Gagg for the Quakers, 1659, p. 16, criticizing George Whitehead and Parrot (should be Parnel) who in Goliah's Head Cut Off, 1655, p. 63, cited Wisdom iv. 8,9. This is repeated in [R. Blome], Fanatick History, 1660, p. 183.

[9] That the Apocrypha of the Old Testament was for Friends generally on a par with non-canonical literature is confirmed by the fact that the few quotations from it come generally in the same writings as show elsewhere a dependence on wide reading or even on scholarly use of many books. Thus "the Son of Syrach" (= Ecclus. xix. 30) is quoted by Ambrose Rigge in the most learnedly annotated of the pieces (True Christianity Vindicated, 1679) collected in his Works (Constancy in the Truth, 1710, p. 254). In like manner of hundreds of Scripture texts occurring in Richard Claridge's Life and Posthumous Works (edited by Joseph Besse, 1726, with index of quotations), there is just one from the Apocrypha, viz. Ecclus. vii. 25 on p. 292. Those editions of Barclay's Apology which undertake to give an index of passages of Scripture mention one from the Apocrypha (Wisdom, ii. 21, Prop. V and VI § xx).

[10] In R. Farnsworth, The Pure Language of the Spirit, 1656, p. 8.

[11] Annual Catalogue of George Fox, 1939, No. 8,165 F (1671).

[12] Epistle 320 (1676). For isolated references to the Apocrypha in Fox's Doctrinals (published in folio in 1706 as Gospel-Truth Demonstrated) I am indebted to A. Neave Brayshaw (cf. his Personality of George Fox, 1919, p. 16, note 6), viz. p. 260 f. (2 Macc. vii. 30), 414 (2 Esdr. i. 30; vii. 26, 28f. Wisd. ii. 12–20), 517 ("in Maccabees"). The three instances on p. 414 belong to the time of Fox's imprisonment at Worcester during which he had access apparently only to a Geneva Bible. While other citations show the influence of his knowledge of the A.V. (see Journal of Friends Historical Society xxi. 1924, p. 2) those from the Apocrypha do not. Presumably he did not recall its wording from memory.

[13] George Fox in his pamphlet Something in Answer to that Book, called the Church-Faith: Set Forth by Independents and Others, etc., answered immediately and almost sentence by sentence the Congregational statement adopted at the

from the narrative books of the Bible his Sacred History; or The Historical Part of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament,[14] though he admits that there are at least four hundred years from the death of Nehemiah to the birth of Christ, with events of importance and interest, he concludes,

> Yet since the Account thereof is to be sought partly from the Apocryphal Books of the Maccabees, partly from other histories of no better Authority; having thus far followed the Thread of Sacred History, thro all the books of the Old Testament, which are generally received as Canonical, that I may not mix Incertainties with Certainties, I here let fall my Pen.

This aversion of non-conformists to the Apocrypha stands in contrast not merely to the practice of contemporary divines,[15] but even to lay literature. The learned Milton did not entirely ignore the books that his amanuensis declined to include in his Sacred History. Twice in Paradise Lost (iv. 168, v. 220) occur allusions to the Book of Tobit. Of Shakespeare's allusions the most famous is to the story of Susanna in

> a Daniel come to Judgment.

But the non-conformist evidently expected little good to come to him from such books. There is a revealing confession in Grace Abounding (Sects. 62–65) of a disconcerting experience of the author. John Bunyan records that he was greatly comforted by a text that ran through his mind,

> 'Look at the generations of old, and see; did ever any trust in the Lord and was confounded?' I looked in my Bible and found it not. For above a year I searched in vain, but at last casting my eye into the apocryphal books, I found it in Ecclus. ii. 10. This at first did somewhat daunt me.

Besides the natural hostility to the apocrypha which Friends shared with other opponents of papacy and prelacy, they were

---

Savoy in October 1658. But for the sentence declaring the Apocrypha to be not of divine inspiration, no part of the canon of scripture, and of no authority (Chap. I, Sect. iii) he offers no criticism.

[14] Folio 1705, Second Edition, 1720, p. 512.

[15] Cf. examples in W. H. Daubney, The Use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church, 1900, pp. 71ff.

subject to an influence drawing them in an opposite direction. No sect sat so free to the claims of Biblical authority as did the Society of Friends. With their emphasis upon the inner light as the primary rule, it was inevitable that they insisted on the secondary, human character of the scriptures. Extra-canonical writings they did not exalt, but rather they brought the canonical ones down to the same level.[16] In controversy — and their view of the scriptures was a major storm centre of controversy — they were led to more extreme depreciation of scripture than they actually practiced, and their opponents ascribed to them even more extravagant words of abuse and acts of profanation.

It is in just this connection that we get the fullest Quaker discussion of the Apocrypha known to me. Rusticus ad Academicos is an enormous controversial work [17] written principally against John Owen of Oxford and Thomas Danson of Sandwich. The author, Samuel Fisher, was a man of good theological training; an opponent calls him "the best scholar that ever professed Quakerism." [18] His argument is to prove the relative fallibility of scripture by the unoriginality of the Hebrew vowel points, the textual variants in manuscripts, the disagreements between translation and original. In the Second Exercitation, Chapter III, he deals with the bounds of the Canon and shows that some of the early writings which had claim to be in the Canon either are lost entirely (p. 81) or (as in the Apocrypha) are not included in the Hebrew Bible. To Samuel Fisher the books of Second Esdras,[19] the Epistle of Jeremiah, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom of Solo-

[16] Muggleton and Reeve with their sense of their own commission as prophets were too critical of canonical scriptures even for the Friends, as the following pamphlet dialogue on words of Solomon (Proverbs vi. 23 and Ecclesiastes xii. 7) suggests: A Letter of Samuel Hooton and W. S. (Quakers) to Lodowick Muggleton: "For first, *the Law is light*, saith Solomon." (The Neck of the Quakers Broken, by Lodowick Muggleton, Amsterdam, 1663, p. 9.) Muggleton: "your ignorance and darkness is plainly discovered, in that you quote *Solomon* to prove your Scripture, light and knowledge of Christ, that which is no Scripture no more than the Apocrypha is, but I perceive it as good Scripture to you as any." (Ibid. p. 24.) The discussion continues in a later exchange of pamphlets.

[17] 1660. Four exercitations, preface and appendix totaling 888 quarto pages of fine print. In the folio edition of Samuel Fisher's works, The Testimony of Truth Exalted, 1679, pages 27 to 772.

[18] John Faldo, Quakerism no Christianity, 1673, p. 82.

[19] This book was evidently a favorite with Fisher as he quotes it in various

mon and the like seem fully as inspired as some of the canonical works. He is aware that for some books the Hebrew originals were extant or had existed, that some are cited in the New Testament (p. 79), and that they were "highly esteemed by Austin and other Fathers" (p. 78). He mentions, too, the "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs now extant," [20] and the Book of Enoch mentioned by Jude, though he regards it as entirely lost.[21] Against the rejection of these from the Canon by the Assembly of Divines in 1648 and in the Confession of the Congregational Church of 1659 Fisher declares (p. 78):

Though I own neither them nor the least bare Writing or outward Text or Letter of the other Scripture at so high a rate as J[ohn] O[wen] does, who makes the naked letter in all things equivalent to the holy matter; yet whatever is truly to be predicated of the one, or can solidly be pleaded on behalf of the one, which ye call your Canon — as to the divinity of their Original, the same may be pleaded on the behalf of not a few of the other.[22]

---

other contexts. John Etherington, a contemporary sectary, believed that "the books of Esdras are and ought to be esteemed part of the canonical scriptures" (quoted from C. E. Whiting, Studies in English Puritanism, 1931, p. 289).

[20] This work was introduced into England in 1242 by Robert Grosseteste in a Latin version. The Greek text was not published until 1698 by Grabe, but a Greek MS was kept at Cambridge to support the authenticity of the Latin translation. A striking evidence of the interest of a Quaker publisher and of a largely Quaker reading public is shown by the fact that an English translation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs was published by the first Philadelphia printer, William Bradford, before 1688. This was probably the form Englished by Antony Gilby with a preface by Richard Day. It was first published in London in 1581 and went through at least eight editions in a century. Like Enoch this work was esteemed authentic by the Muggletonians, but its more general popularity is attested by its frequent reprinting. No doubt this English version was known to Samuel Fisher, or the Latin version. The Bradford imprint would be very precious if a copy could be found. It is not even listed in the bibliographies. No copy was known to the expert in Bradford, the late Henry F. De Puy of New York. But it is definitely advertised at the back of the rare work by Daniel Leeds, mentioned below, p. 204. An edition, "the three and fortieth," printed and sold by William and Andrew Bradford in New York, 1712, is known through a copy in the Huntington Library, California. Perhaps one of these was the edition of which the Germantown Quaker Francis D. Pastorius (1651–1719/20) left two copies. See M. D. Learned, Pastorius, p. 280, No. 31.

[21] In this he is unlike John Milton who probably knew the long quotation from Enoch in the Chronography of Georgius Syncellus. See D. Saurat, Milton, Man and Thinker, 1925, p. 254. G. McColley, "The Book of Enoch and Paradise Lost," Harvard Theological Review, xxxi, 1938, 21ff. The fuller Ethiopic text was first published in England by Laurence in translation in 1821, in transcription in 1838.

[22] The same position is implied though not explicitly stated in Barclay's Apology, Proposition III, Sect. i.

From the Old Testament Apocrypha Samuel Fisher's discussion passes over to the New. We may follow him in the transition. His argument again is based partly on lost books mentioned in the canonical text and partly on uncanonical books still in circulation. The latter include Paul's letter to the Laodiceans (pp. 88 ff) whose genuineness he defends, "several to Seneca, Nero's tutor," Clement's Epistle to the Church of Rome, the correspondence between Agbarus king of Edessa and Christ recorded in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus, and the words of Paul at his martyrdom, not recorded by Luke in the Acts (pp. 82 f).

In striking coincidence with this enumeration are the contents of an anonymous twelve-page tract entitled Something concerning Agbarus, Prince of the Edesseans, etc. The full contents are of interest:

(a) "The Epistle of Agbarus [23] unto our Saviour."
(b) "The Epistle of Christ unto Agbarus."
(c) "Unto these Epistles there were also these things added in the Syrian Tongue."
(d) "The Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans."
(e) The verse about a man working on the sabbath in Luke vi.
(f) "Concerning the Death of Paul." [24]
(g) "A Catalogue of those Scriptures which are mentioned, but not inserted in the Bible."
(h) "Several Scriptures Corrupted by the Translators."
(i) "The Difference betwixt the Old Translation and New."

The relations of this tract to other writings are unfortunately not clear. Items (h) and (i) are practically identical with the lists at the end of The Great Mystery of the Great Whore Unfolded, a work assigned to George Fox, 1659.[25] But the remainder of the contents of the tract agrees very closely with the section in Fisher's Rusticus ad Academicos, though it gives the text of the writings which the latter merely discusses. Of (d) the tract

[23] This spelling as a variant of Abgar goes back to the Greek MSS of Eusebius, from whose Church History (a), (b) and (c) are derived.

[24] I do not identify the source of the brief narrative quoted.

[25] Pp. 373–375. It contains after (h) a Hebrew quotation and a Greek not found in the pamphlet. The pamphlet has one more example in (h) and three more in (i). Cf. Journal of Friends Hist. Society, xxi. 1924, p. 2.

says that it "was found in the oldest Bible that was printed at Worms," Fisher (p. 89) "being both Translated and Printed in English, as it was found, though not in your Testaments, yet in the Oldest Bible that was printed at Worms; [26] and also in a certain Antient Manuscript of the New Testament Text, which I have seen and can produce written in Old English 340 years since, or above, before the Art of Printing came up here." [27] Of the man working on the sabbath Fisher (p. 91) says simply "a verse between the 5 and 6 Verses of the 6 Chapter of Luke, which is in some Greek copies . . . I repeated it in English thus out of the Greek; in which Greek tongue I have also read it." The pamphlet derives it from "a translation of the New Testament into both Latine and English, each correspondent one to another . . . faithfully translated by John Hollybushe, 1538, and printed in Southwark by James Nicholson, and set forth by the Kings Licence" [28] where it is referred to "in the margent" as occurring in "one of the Greek copies."

[26] This Epistle, with a similar reference to "the oldest Bible that was printed at Worms" is prefixed to a still older Quaker pamphlet, viz. Henry Clark, A Rod Discover'd, 1657 (also reprinted 1659). It was also published separately about 1681 by the Quaker printer John Bringhurst. This may refer to one of the Bibles in Latin, or in German printed at Worms. In the latter language the early versions frequently included "Laodiceans." Of English versions not only the octavo edition of Tyndale's New Testament, 1525, was printed at Worms, but probably the Quarto of the same date begun at Cologne was finished there, but I am not aware that either contained the epistle to the Laodiceans.

[27] In some forms of the Wycliffite version (but not Purvey's revision) the Epistle of the Laodiceans followed Colossians in the MSS. On the history of this epistle see especially Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, pp. 274–300. Since MSS of the Wycliffite version are now quite rare we note that Fisher seems to have had access to one. Benjamin Furly also owned one. See W. I. Hull, Benjamin Furly, 1941, p. 149, note 81.

[28] This is easily identified as the second of the three 1538 Latin-English Testaments of Coverdale. It was published by Nicolson without the authority of Coverdale under the name of John Hollybushe (S.T.C. 2818; British and Foreign Bible Society Catalogue, No. 20). These editions were specifically intended, as Coverdale explains in the preface, to call attention to variants between the versions. This is manifestly a reference to the reading of Codex Bezae. Whether any other singular reading of that famous manuscript is cited by Coverdale I do not know. But even this one by itself is important, if it is correctly dated, in that it is several years earlier than the earliest known citation of this famous MS (Council of Trent, 1546, Stephanus, N.T., 1550) mentioned by J. R. Harris, A Study of Codex Bezae (Texts and Studies, ii. 1 = Haverford College Studies, No. 8) 1891, pp. 3, 36–39, or by J. H. Ropes, Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. III, 1926, pp. lvif. Yet so far as I can learn, the known copies of the Hollybushe Testaments have no such printed marginal note. Surely the author did not mean a handwritten note

The authorship of this tract remains as uncertain as its date. Is it older than the two larger books of 1659–1660 which it resembles, or younger? Is it from the same author as either of them — Fisher,[29] Fox, or is it a compilation by a later hand? The reprints in 1680 and 1697 [30] supply at most a *terminus ad quem*, and the direction of dependence does not seem to me obvious from comparing the parallels.

These thin quarto pamphlets could easily be inserted in the current Bible and indeed were probably so intended. This explains a passage in the autobiographical manuscript of Elizabeth Hooton and incidentally shows that either this pamphlet or another containing at least (d) and (h) was in print at the time of her second visit to Boston. She tells how in 1663 in Cambridge "Daniel Goggins [Gookin] the magistrate walked out of the door with my Bible in his hand for it had the Epistle to the Laodiceans and other things opening of the corruption of translations." [31]

---

on a printed Bible. Perhaps he has confused the date and imprint of the Bible containing the printed note though his reference is perfectly explicit, but I cannot suggest the real solution. The reading occurs as a footnote from 1561 on in New Testaments containing Beza's Greek and Latin and the Vulgate. George Whitehead was criticized for trying to "prove the Breach of the sabbath lawful from a moth-eaten manuscript cited by Beza in his Annot. on Luke 6" (Henry Hallywell, An Account of Familism as it is Revived and Propagated by the Quakers, 1673, p. 121) and promptly defended by William Penn (Wisdom Justified, 1673, pp. 125f).

[29] I see belatedly that W. C. Braithwaite has an excellent summary of Fisher's work (Beginnings of Quakerism, 1912, pp. 288–294) and that he conjectures (p. 291 note) that the tract was by Fisher.

[30] Jos. Smith, Catalogue of Friends Books, 1867, i, pp. 39f. Jos. Smith evidently placed the original edition near 1675. The Catalogue of Printed Books in the British Museum dated it as "1660?" The new edition of the same, i. 1931, col. 334 dates it "1663 (?)." An edition is advertised in 1682 by the Quaker printer John Bringhurst. MS copies of some or all of this material are found belonging to William Briggins in 1671 (Eliot Howard, The Eliot Papers, ii, 1895, p. 19) and, with the addition of the thirteen letters between Paul and Seneca, to George Fox (Annual Catalogue, pp. 205f). Though they are probably copied out of the printed tract, one comes upon such items with some surprise in the written records of quite remote meetings in the American colonies. For example the Symous Creek, North Carolina, monthly meeting minute book includes (d), (e), (g), (h) and (f). It may be noted that other publications included parts of this list. John L. Nickalls calls my attention to the fact that item (g) occurs on p. 44 in a quarto tract of 1659 by Edward Billing, A Word of Reproof and Advice to my late Fellow-Souldiers, etc. (Smith, Cata. i. 269). Also items (d), (f), (g), (h) appeared anonymously in a tract with the imprint and date Andrew Sowle, 1680 (ibid. i. 40).

[31] Emily Manners, Elizabeth Hooton, First Quaker Woman Preacher (1600–1672), 1914, p. 43. Cambridge Historical Society Publications, xxiv, 1938, p. 73. For the date see Bulletin of Friends Historical Association, xxvii, 1938, pp. 14f.

The material was evidently used in oral debate. So Fisher himself is reported in 1659 to have criticized the use of the canonical letters as part of a standing rule of faith and life by appealing to Paul's lost letter to Corinth (1 Cor. 5:9) and to his extant letter to the Laodiceans.[32] Forty years later William Penn argues from various lost works named in the Bible that the extant scriptures are "imperfect as to number." [33]

For Fox's interest in what for want of a better name we commonly call New Testament Apocrypha at least one more certain piece of evidence is extant.[34] In an unpublished list now at the Library of Friends House of over one hundred of "G ff's Books at W.M's" in 1695 one entry (No. 71) reads

Nicodemus his Gospel.[35]

[32] Thomas Danson, The Quakers Folly, Second Edit., 1659, pp. 26f. The charge is repeated in [R. Blome] Fanatick History . . . of the Old Anabaptists and New Quakers, 1660, p. 173.

[33] A Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practice, 1699, p. 10.

[34] The list of apostolic martyrs in Fox's tract against the Conventicle Act of 1668 (Gospel-Truth Demonstrated, p. 302) rests ultimately largely on apocryphal Acts but probably the list came more directly to Fox from some mediate source like John Foxe's Book of Martyrs, Book I, or perhaps from the "Register of the Death Sufferings and Martyrdom of the Prophets and Apostles" in William Caton's Abridgement of Eusebius Pamphilus's Ecclesiastical History, 1661.

A much better known reference by Fox to early Christian martyrs is in connection with his walking barefoot in Lichfield crying "Woe unto the bloody city of Lichfield." Apparently at the time (1651) he had no rationalization of his conduct, but later he explains (Camb. Journal, i. 16) "I came to see that there was 1000 martyrs in Dioclesians time was martyred in Lichfeilde and soe I must goe in my stockings through the Channel of there bloode and come into ye poole of there bloode . . . which had beene shed above a 1000 years before . . . & the antient records will testify how many of the (Christian) Britaines suffered there." Here again we seem to have a hint of learned historical information which it has been supposed (W. C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 56) Fox had "learnt out of John Speed's Chronicle or some such source." It has apparently been forgotten that the very name of the city, meaning 'field of corpses,' demanded an explanation and that almost certainly a popular etymology kept afloat the suggestion without recourse to records. Thus quite independently the same event is mentioned in a contemporary continental geographical work which I happen to possess (Rutgeni Hermannidae Britannia Magna, Amsterdam, 1661, p. 206): "Lichfeld locus martyrum sub Diocletiano cadaveribus celebris." As the use of *cadaver* in the Latin writing betrays the etymological motif in the background, so I think in Fox does the statement that the martyrs "lay colde in there streets."

[35] The list has been published in full, with identifications, by John L. Nickalls in the Journal of Friends Historical Society, xxviii (1931), pp. 3–21. This item may be easily identified as the same as an entry in the British Museum Catalogue, Vol. 52, part i, 1892, col. 271: "Nichodemus his Gospel [Translated into English and edited by J. Warren] by John Cousturier [Rouen, 1620 ?]." S.T.C. 18571.

A very late apocryphon, but one of general subject matter like the Acts of Pilate and the Gospel of Nicodemus, is the letter of Publius Lentulus which he sent to the Roman Senate, in which is contained a description of the personal appearance of Jesus.[36] The evidence of early Quaker acquaintance and use of it comes to light in connection with the tragic story of the blasphemous adoration received and claimed by James Nayler in 1656. According to a hostile pamphlet published anonymously in 1656 [37] Nayler himself attempted to add to his other claims a physical resemblance to the Messiah:

> He doth strive in his looks and posture to imitate the picture of our Saviour as it was sent up to Rome in the days of Tiberius Caesar and he strives to wear his hair as it were with a seam on the crown of his head and so flowing down on each side of it.

Another hostile writer, Ralph Farmer, in an account of Nayler's entrance into Bristol and his trial before the Magistrates, says [38] that his female admirers actually carried a copy of this apocryphon with them. He quotes it in full, prefacing these remarks:

> And now to see the diligence of these Impostors and Deceivers, the more to facilitate their delusions, and to gain upon simple people, who are taken with any foppery that comes in a way new, unusuall, and extraordinary; they (these women) carried with them (and which was found about one of them) a description of our Lord Jesus Christ, in respect of his person and outward feature, as it was sent to the Romane Senate, by Publius Lentulus President in Judea, under Tiberius Caesar the Romane Emperorer.

A third passage is in a description of Quakerism from a curious work purporting to be Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy who lived five and forty years undiscovered at Paris (1637–1682): [39]

[36] See M. R. James, The Apocryphal N.T. 1924, pp. 477f., who dates its origin as not earlier than the Thirteenth Century. R. Eisler, The Messiah Jesus, 1931, believes the description goes back to the official Roman report of the crucifixion.

[37] The Quakers Quaking. The quotation is taken from M. R. Brailsford, A Quaker from Cromwell's Army, 1927, p. 44. The original pamphlet — to be distinguished from one of like title and date by Jeremiah Ives — exists in the British Museum. See Jos. Smith, Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana, 1873, p. 12.

[38] Sathan Enthroned in His Chair of Pestilence, etc. London, 1657, p. 25.

[39] Extracted from the 26th ed., London, 1770, vol. vi., pp. 13–16, and published in the Journal of Friends Historical Society, viii, 1911, pp. 25ff.

They say the ringleader of this people professes himself to be the Messias, being, in all parts of his body and features of his face, like Jesus the son of Mary: Or, at least, it is observed, that he exactly resembles the portraiture of him which Publius Lentulus sent to the Senate of Rome out of Judaea, when he was Governor of that province. Hence his followers scruple not to call him "Jesus, the beauty of ten thousand," etc.

It is evident from these passages that the association of Nayler with the apocryphal word picture of Jesus was a standing item in the charge of blasphemy, and so far as was possible without colors [40] it was used in the many hostile portraits and caricatures of him that were published in many books of the time. This information was ultimately based on an item in the Report of the Committee of Parliament. I quote it from the Quaker pamphlet which republished it with defensive notes in the margin: [41]

One thing also being part of the matter of fact, we think worthy your knowledge, though much stress will not be lain on it; And that is, that the descriptions of our Saviour by Publius Lentulus to the Senate of Rome in writing, (which is also imprinted) was taken upon one of James Naylers Attendance, which is also certified by the said Major; And for Nayler's hair both colour and manner of wearing it, as also the fashion of his beard, and feature and person did much agree with that description, which all so was taken notice of by many of the Committee, how much he resembled (as they apprehended with some affectation) the Picture usually drawn for our Saviour.

To which the marginal notes make reply:

It seems you will pass by nothing you think hath anything in it that might raise up evil thoughts; you had done justly had all been writ was said by the sufferer, to prove his innocencie.

And to whom do you impute this fault, seeing there was no art used

[40] I may mention here, since it is not included in the Anti-Quaker bibliography nor used in the recent lives of Nayler, a French twelve page pamphlet without author's name or date, but with colophon "A Paris, Chez Alexandre Lesselin . . . Avec Permission." The title reads: "Le Veritable Portrait et l'Histoire de Iacques Nayler, Chef des Trembleurs & Pretendu Messie, Avec son Arrest de condamnation, prononcé par le Parlement d'Angleterre," and under it is a large woodcut portrait of Nayler.

[41] A True Narrative of the Examination, Tryall and Sufferings of James Nayler, 1657, p. 6. This part of the pamphlet is anonymous. It may be by Robert Rich or even George Fox, both of whom are signatories to later parts of it.

either to the head, beard, or feature, but was the work of the Creator. How do you love your example, who count him the greatest offender that God hath made most like him. Neither was the letter forementioned known by the Sufferer to be amongst any of his Company, till afterwards it was taken from them, and so he told the Speaker when before them.

Of extra canonical authorities in the wider sense, that affected the Friends, we must speak here more briefly. For George Fox's many esoteric interests we might quote either the epithets applied to him by William Penn in the testimony he wrote as preface to the Journal "a divine and a naturalist and all of God's own making" or the report of a conversation with Fox made by Edward Bourne: [42]

In our discourse together on the Rode before our parting, Hee speak of the Glory of the first body, & of the Egiptian Learning, & of the Language of the birds, & of wt was wonnderfull to mee to heare, soe that I believed he was of a Deep and wonnderfull understanding in naturall, but especially in Sptuall things.

Fox's interest in what we would call today natural science is attested by his oft-expressed sense of unity with the creation. Of an early experience he wrote in his Journal: [43]

The creation was opened to me; and it was showed me how all things had their names given them according to their nature and virtue. I was at a stand in my mind, whether I should practise physic for the good of mankind, seeing the nature and virtues of things were so opened to me by the Lord.

Fox's later cures and knowledge of nature were no doubt assigned by him to miraculous power and to revelation vouchsafed to those who "receive the Word of Wisdom, that opens all things, and come to know the hidden unity in the Eternal Being." [44] Yet more human means of knowledge were not despised by him. In the realm of medicine this is shown by his gift of land to Friends in Philadelphia as a botanical garden "for the lads and lasses to

[42] Norman Penney, First Publishers of Truth, p. 278. The journey was one from Worcester towards Tewkesbury in the year 1655.

[43] Centenary Edit. 1911, i. 28.

[44] Ibid, p. 29, with still further openings about physicians.

learn simples there, and the uses to convert them to, — distilled waters, oils, ointments, &c." [45] In his own library, as in that of many another Friend, books of general medicine were represented. The list already mentioned included among the titles "The English Physitian. Culpeper." This is evidently the handbook widely circulated from 1653 to 1809 written by Nicholas Culpeper (1616–1654). Among other bequests he included "all my Physical Things that came from beyond the Sea with the outlandish Cupp and that thing that People do give Glisters with And my two Dials the one is an Equinoctial Diall." [46]

It is difficult to say certainly what realm of thought or reading lies behind the subjects discussed by Fox with Dr. Bourne. If "the glory of the first body" refers to the nature of man before the Fall we can recognize in it a favorite subject of reference in Fox's writings. Like Jacob Boehme who may have somewhat influenced him here, as we know he did elsewhere,[47] Fox always held up as a standard the ideal state "before fightings, etc. was." A study of this concentration on paradisiacal idealism and of its roots in contemporary thinking [48] would contribute, I suspect, a good deal to the understanding of Fox.

There was more than one writer in the seventeenth century whose ornithological studies included the "languages of the birds." For the "Egiptian Learning" I may venture a more definite guess. There is much evidence that the Early Friends were attracted by the writings attributed to Hermes Trismegistus, an Egyptian deity upon whom were fathered many Neo-Platonic or astrological treatises composed at different periods of the Christian era. The attraction of the pseudonym for Friends was not the lure of Egypt, though of course Egyptian wisdom had long been fabu-

[45] See references in A. N. Brayshaw's Personality of George Fox, 1933, p. 114 and Bulletin of Friends Historical Society, iii, 1909, pp. 100f.

[46] The Cambridge Journal, 1911, ii, p. 355. Fox's relation to the medical art and medical profession will be discussed in my forthcoming work on George Fox's Book of Miracles.

[47] See H. H. Brinton, The Mystic Will, 1930, p. 68. For Boehme's influence on Friends see now G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Experience, 1946, pp. 16–18. In September 1674 the morning meeting in connection with the draft of an Epistle to Behmenists by Ralph Fretwell expressed an adverse judgment on Boehme's writings.

[48] One of the works of F. M. van Helmont (see below) was on the first four chapters of Genesis.

lous, but rather the congenial content of the religious and philosophical tracts and the universally accepted antiquity of the authorship. John Everard (c. 1575–1650) not only deeply influenced Friends directly by his own writings,[49] but made accessible to English readers much of the mystical philosophy that especially appealed to them, including works of Henry Nicolas and Sebastian Franck,[50] and also Dionysius the Areopagite. In 1650, five years before this conversation of George Fox, there appeared an English rendering of The Divine Pymander of Hermes Mercurius Trismegistus "translated formerly by that learned divine Dr. Everard," to which a second edition added the Asclepius. In the preface [51] to the work is plainly stated the priority of Hermes to Moses, much after the manner of calculation of early Christian apologists. It is not improbable that Fox had read this attractive little book.

A work like this, of accepted pre-Mosaic origin, suits perfectly the contention of Samuel Fisher that the period of inspiration is not precisely that represented in the Bible. He argues [52] from the Apocrypha that the canon need not close with Malachi for the Old Testament and Revelation for the New:

[49] See the appreciative references to Everard by William Penn (Works, 1726, vol. II, pp. 395, 398). Another of the lost publications (cf. note 20) of the Quaker printer, William Bradford, was an English translation of Everard's Gospel Treasury Opened. It is advertised in 1694 "as printed and to be sold by" him. At a later date Anthony Benezet (1713–1784) was evidently a great admirer of Everard. He marked and distributed copies of the 1757 edition of "Some Gospel Treasures," Christopher Saur, Germantown, and I suspect had promoted its publication. Cf. G. S. Brookes, Friend Anthony Benezet, 1937, pp. 223, 305.

[50] The works translated were, respectively, Franck's De Arbore scientiae boni et mali and Nicolas' Spiegel der Gerechtigkeit. Precisely these two works appear also in the list of George Fox's possessions, the former in the English translation of 1640, the latter, which was never published in English, in German. Journal of Friends Historical Society, xxviii, 1931, pp. 9, 18. Other works of Henry Nicolas were published in English and doubtless were known in circles of dissent. See C. E. Whiting, Studies in English Puritanism, 1931, p. 287. A quotation from Sebastian Franck's Chronicle occurs also in George Fox's letter to John III, King of Poland (John Sobieski) written in 1677, and later printed in German. But this and other quotations make it almost certain that Fox himself did not write the letter (Penney in Camb. Journal, ii, 466) though he alone signed it. This was already observed by Croese who regarded it as a mark of Fox's pride (General History of the Quakers, 1696, pp. 240ff.).

[51] Signed J. F. "This book may justly challenge the first place for antiquity, from all the Books in the World, being written some hundreds of years before Moses his time, as I shall endevor to make good."

[52] Loc. cit. p. 76.

Who was it that said to the Spirit of God, O Spirit, blow no more, inspire no more men, make no more Prophets from Ezra's dayes and downwards till Christ; and from John's dayes downward for ever?

In like manner he asks John Owen who had referred to God's speaking "in the prophets from the dayes of Moses and downward unto the Bounding and Consignation of the Canon": —

Why sayest thou from Moses downwards &c. as if he had never done so before then? Did not God speak in his Prophets, and by them to the men of their several ages from Moses upwards as well as from Moses downwards? Did he not speak in Enoch the seventh from Adam, in Noah, in Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Lot and Job, who lived before Moses (if Catholick Tradition be to be Credited in one thing as well as another) and whose book, who ever Pen'd it, whether himself, or some other, for ought thou knowest was written before Moses, who thou thinkest wrote the first of the Scripture, either lived or wrote? [53]

And again referring to the prophecy of Enoch and other lost books Fisher asks:

When are all these, and sundry more Scriptures (some as, and some more Antient then Moses) of which I will not speak particularly? [54]

Fisher does not "speak particularly" of Hermes. But R[ichard] R[uckhill] in 1673 in a tract entitled The Quakers Refuge Fixed upon the Rock of Ages speaks of him both particularly and conspicuously. In the very first words of his second main division he proposes as subject for consideration (p. 17) "Whether the first Pen-man of the Scriptures was Moses or Hermes or whether both these are not one. . . ." It is no wonder that such an astounding question caught the repeated attack of more than one of later Anti-Quaker writers.[55]

[53] P. 71.

[54] P. 82.

[55] Francis Bugg, New Rome Unmasked, 1692, p. 23; Francis Bugg, New Rome Arraigned, 1694, p. 47; Charles Leslie, The Snake in the Grass, 1696, p. 142; Francis Bugg, The Quakers Set in Their True Light, 1696, pp. 15f, 44; Daniel Leeds, News of a Trumpet Sounding in the Wilderness, New York, 1697, p. 72; Charles Leslie, A Defence of . . . The Snake in the Grass, 1700, p. 145. George Whitehead in his Truth and Innocency Vindicated, 1699, p. 57, answering an anonymous attack, Some Few of the Quakers Many Horrid Blasphemies, etc. 1698/9, that had been delivered to the Houses of Parliament and that had quoted (p. 6) the same passage from The Quaker's Refuge attributing it to John White-

None of the Quakers thus far quoted show any unmistakable knowledge of the actual text of Hermes. It is possible that many of them knew it only second hand.[56] But George Keith certainly knew the Poimander. In the Postscript[57] to his Universall Free Grace of the Gospel Asserted, 1671, p. 128, in a collection of evidences of divine revelation to the heathen, is mentioned explicitly "Hermes Trismegistus his Divine Pimander translated out of Arabick by the famous Dr Everard, printed in English 1657." In The Way Cast up, 1677, p. 136, Keith quotes the "noted saying of Hermes Trismegist: God is a Circle, whose center is everywhere, and is nowhere circumscribed." A reference to this passage occurs in The True Christ Owned, 1679, p. 79, and on page 52 a reference to a similar "noted Saying of H. Trismegistus."

A less known but equally pseudonymous work is an early example of the Robinson Crusoe literature, — the philosophy of Hai Ebn Yokdan. The first English translation of it published anonymously in 1674 is now definitely proved to have been the work of George Keith.[58] The whole title runs as follows:

An account of the Oriental Philosophy, shewing, The Wisdom of some Renowned Men of the East; and particularly, The Profound Wisdom of Hai Ebn Yokdan, both in Natural and Divine things; which he attained without all Converse with Men (while he lived in an Island a solitary life, remote from all Men from his Infancy, till he arrived at such perfection, Writ Originally in Arabick, by Abi Jaaphar Ebn Tophail; And out of the Arabick Translated into Latine by Edward

---

head, points out that the sentence ends: — "is not the subject of my argument at this time." So also in his Antidote against the Venome of the Snake in the Grass, 1697, pp. 83ff.

[56] There is some reason to think that Milton's reference to 'thrice great Hermes' (Il Penseroso 88) is due to the influence of a reference to Hermes in Lactantius. See E. C. Baldwin, Modern Language Notes, xxxiii, 1918, p. 185.

[57] This postscript is signed B[enjamin] F[urly] as well as G.K., and the quotations are, I think, due to the former. Another postscript by Benjamin Furly supplied a like reference to Hermes,. declaring that he like Socrates and Plato knew Christ. This passage occurs at the end of the German tract by William Caton, Eine Beschirmung d' Unschuldigen, Amsterdam, 1664.

[58] In a letter that year Henry More writes to Lady Conway: "He [George Keith] gave me a little book which he had told into English, of the Orientall Philosophy, and particularly of the profound wisdom of Hai Ebn Yokdan." Marjorie Hope Nicolson, Conway Letters, 1930, p. 392.

Pocock, a Student in Oxford; and now faithfully out of his Latine; Translated into English, For a general Service.[59]

It is easy to see from the title why this book appealed especially to Friends. It was an excellent confirmation of their theory of direct revelation of God to men, even to men without the Scriptures and outside the Christian religion.

Two years after Keith's translation Barclay's Apology makes reference to the same work.[60] Keith may have introduced his friend Barclay to it, but Barclay whose reading is wide may also have known it independently in Latin, the language in which it circulated and in which the Apology was first written. Both of them evidently took the work as real history rather than fiction.[61]

Other and more pervasive oriental influences came to Friends and especially to George Keith. An interest in the Cabbala existed in many groups at the time. In England its influence upon Milton[62] and upon the Cambridge Platonists are only two illustrations. Henry More, for example, undertook to translate the

[59] For modern studies of this work see the Journal of Friends Historical Society, xxvii, 1930, pp. 65f.

[60] Propositions V & VI, xxvii. After some discussion the passage was officially excluded from later editions. See Joseph Smith, The Society of Friends, Robert Barclay and Hai Ebn Yokdan, 1862.

[61] A similar attraction led Friends to publish the gentile apocryphon, The Upright Lives of the Heathen briefly noted: or Epistles and Discourses betwixt Alexander the Conqueror and Dindimus King of the Brachmans, Giving an account of what sort of People they are, their Divinity and Phylosophy with their manner of living, &c. Smith, Cata. i, 42, enters only one quarto edition as [1683]. But there is a dated edition of 1683 as well as an undated edition, whose advertisement includes books published as late as 1684. The latter in a postscript calls attention to "a paper lately published entitled, A Dialogue betwixt an East Indian Brachman and a Christian, price 1d."

Almost in the same year as its first publication by the Quaker bookseller, Andrew Sowle, a more recent and authentic testimony to religion from a non-Christian source became available to Friends. Ockanickon the Indian chief, friend and neighbor of the colony at Burlington, East Jersey, died early in 1682. Before the year was out was published in London over the name of John Cripps of Burlington, A True Account of the Dying Words of Ockanickon, an Indian King, spoken to Jahkursoe, his Brother's Son, whom he appointed King after him (reprinted with facsimile, Journal of Friends Historical Society, ix. 164ff). This item and the preceding were combined by Charles Wolverton, another Friend, and published by A. and W. Bradford in Philadelphia, 1740.

[62] See Saurat, op. cit., pp. 281ff. Cf. Harris F. Fletcher, Milton's Rabbinical Readings, 1930 (Urbana, Ill.)

Zohar into English, as his contemporary and friend Peganius (Baron Christian Knorr von Rosenroth) translated it into German. Keith was intimate with More and shared the cabbalistic interests with him. But more extreme than either More or Keith was probably their common friend, the notable "scholar gypsy" Francis Mercurius van Helmont (1618–1699), who came to England in 1670 and exercised a profound influence on both of them. For a time at least van Helmont must be regarded as himself a Quaker. He brought with him a deep seated interest in Jewish studies,[63] as also in apocalyptic interpretation, and in natural science. More fully than perhaps any other actual member of the Society of Friends van Helmont is a representative of the cabbalistic lore of the day. Much material about him remains unpublished, but it is to be hoped that the attention that Professor Nicolson has called to him may be extended to a thorough study of this Quaker scion of a famous father.[64] His influence on Keith is blamed for the latter's apostasy from Quakerism. John Whiting in Persecution Expos'd, 1715, p. 232f says that Keith's "odd notions" could be observed "even from the time of van Helmont's being in London, about the Year 1682, which dimmed his Spiritual Eye and weakened him inwardly, as to Truth." This statement is easily believed in the light of recent studies. Among the "odd notions" is mentioned a special hobby of van Helmont's "The Revolution of Humane Souls."

But the meeting of Keith and van Helmont belongs before 1682 [65] and certainly this interest in the nature of the soul came independently to Keith from his own earlier studies. This is shown by his repeated use of the Hebrew terms, to explain which he appeals not merely to Buxtorf's Hebrew lexicon, but to Appara-

[63] Besides his work with von Rosenroth there is attributed to him the publication in 1693 of Seder Olam, sive Ordo Seculorum.

[64] He was the son of Johannes Baptista van Helmont, "the last of the alchemists and the first of the chemists." The material about him collected by the late Dr. F. S. Darrow, of Rochester, N. Y., has since his death come into the possession of Western Reserve University, Cleveland. It is difficult to point to any satisfactory account of the younger van Helmont, though I have not seen the monograph of Broeckx (1870). His works were several of them translated into English, one of them, Divine Being and its Attributes (1693), by an equally intermittent Quaker, Benjamin Furly. See Bibliotheca Furliana, p. 147, No. 823, cf. pp. 267f.

[65] Van Helmont apparently came to England in 1670 and returned to the continent in 1680.

tus in Librum Zohar.[66] Keith himself had already been under the influence of Cabbala and was in turn spreading its influence to others like Barclay. In spite of Keith's eloquent renunciation of all human learning it was precisely their learning that exposed men like Keith and Furly and van Helmont to the vagaries of Jewish lore.[67]

As it is at this point that Quakerism came nearest to being influenced in doctrine by esoteric lore, I may quote at length Croese's account of its origin and influence. He writes: [68]

There was yet another Tenet which Keith was not averse to, but he was unwilling to obtrude it upon any, for that those of that Society did not desire it should be receiv'd or entertain'd, for their common Principle; it was that of the perpetuity of Souls, and of their Transmigration and Variation through several bodies; which proceeded at first from Empedocles, Pythagoras and Plato; and was afterwards variously trimm'd and furbish'd about some hundred years ago, by those pratling Jewish Masters, cal'd Rabbius, who not only tell but write when awake, whatever they have dream'd upon that subject, while asleep; particularly by R. Jitzhakus Loriensis,[69] in a tractate wrote in Hebrew; and in these our days is reviv'd by Baron van Hel-

[66] The True Christ Owned, 1679, p. 68. Another reference to "the Zohar and the mystical writings of the Jews" occurs in another connection in Keith's Truth Advanced in the Correction of Many Gross and Hurtful Errors, New York, 1694, p. 153. This book, said to be the first book printed in New York, belongs to the time when Keith had left Quakerism. But he had not forgotten his cabbalistic studies with their apocalyptic calculations. I may quote a memorandum of Theodor Sippel, dated London 15 October, 1928: "Already the first book of G. K. (Immediate Revelation, 1667) shows the cabbalistical background of his theology, and terms of the Jewish cabbala abound in it. All his later books are on the same line until he left Friends. The best exposition of his cabbalistic doctrine is the book of 1679, The True Light Owned. There he gives important quotations from his Jewish authorities."

[67] It may be noted that all three of the persons named were unstable in their Quakerism, or at least sat very free as respects the corporate life of the Society. Unlike van Helmont, the others have become the subject of modern biographies: W. I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, 1941 (pages 105–123 are on van Helmont); E. W. Kirby, George Keith (1638–1716), New York, 1942. Another continental savant with cabbalistic leanings, who for a time was a Friend (in Rhode Island), was Christian Lodowick. See Journal of Friends Historical Society, xxxiii, 1936, 20ff. The library which Furly collected as disclosed by the catalogue of sale is astonishing. It is also very useful for this or any similar study of the reading of the day. Cf. note 64.

[68] G. Croese, General History of the Quakers, Parts II and III, pp. 37ff.

[69] This spelling is unchanged from the Latin of Croese. This is, of course, Isaac ben Solomon Ashkenazi Luria (1534–1572), "founder of the modern Cabala."

mont, who hath deck'd it with all the necessary Ornaments fit to procure it Reception; an Author famous for the splendour of his Nobility, and his insatiable desires after Knowledge and Learning, which he accounted the most comely and laudable Enjoyments he could be Master of; who because he lives well and has not whereupon, is deem'd by his friends to have found out the Philosophers Stone. This Man living in England at that time, conversing among the Quakers as one of their Society, had occasion frequently to converse with a Noble Countess,[70] that was a great admirer of Knowledge and Learning, and to reason with her out of the Book of Plato, concerning this Platonical Doctrine, and came that length with her, that both he and she embrac'd the same opinion for a truth; and because Keith was oftimes present at the Conferences, they bring him in also to take share in the same opinion.

Which being known to the Quakers, Helmont, who was a stiff Defender of his own Opinions, which they look'd upon, some of them, as Dangerous Innovations; others, as foolish Errors, and Distracted Notions, became suspected and hated by them; upon which he bids farewell to them, and all their Society, proceeding not only to Vindicate his Opinion, but because he thought it yet rude and unpolish'd, to refine and adorn the same, instructing himself again and again out of the Jewish Writings, of what might be serviceable to his Design, digesting his Thoughts into this Form, which I give you a Draught of in as few words as possibly I may:

Before the Souls are united to their Bodies, they exist in another World; after they are united to the bodies, each of them has its day of the Divine Visitation, after One Thousand Years, given to it for this end, that by absolute Holiness and Sanctification, it may prepare for eternal Felicity; But if it abuse the Goodness of God, that it may expect to be condemn'd to that long and terrible Punishment which God hath prepared for them at the expiring of this their set Time. But this Space of a Thousand Years is not continual and undivided, but distinguish'd and circumscribed by Twelve Revolutions or Circuits of the Soul into the same Body, except unto some of the Saints who are purg'd and sanctified enough in the first or second Circuit. And these Returns happen after Three Hundred Thirty Three Years and Four Months. But while they are out of the Body, they do not advance or proceed in Piety; therefore if they be good, it goes well with them; if ill, they fare the worse. Those Souls which before the Death of Christ were

[70] This was Anne, Viscountess Conway (1631–1679). See Marjorie Hope Nicolson, Conway Letters, 1930.

translated from this Life, and were not saved, when they return to their Bodies, may obtain Salvation through the Gospel of Christ. But those since the Death of Christ, to the End of the World, that have not heard of the Gospel, shall return again to their Bodies, all at one time, and in one place, and then shall hear with their Ears the Tidings of the Gospel, and obtain Salvation, if they believe. After that the Saints return to the Earth, the First Resurrection shall be, and all the Saints shall live upon Earth a Thousand Years without any Sin, even as Adam in the State of Inocence; and after the Example of Adam, they shall be born of Virgins, being begot of God their Father. Then the Second Resurrection shall follow, when the Saints shall, after the Example of Christ the Second Adam, be made perfect, and consummated in their Heavenly Bodies. And lastly, The Felicity and Bliss of the Godly shall be Eternal, but the Punishment of the Wicked shall be Finite, and at length terminate in an End.

To what extent Keith definitely accepted the doctrine of transmigration is somewhat difficult to determine. Croese, his contemporary, writing of his trial in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, September 1691, says, "Whereas Keith did not so much define as suppose or leave to be examined as truth what was attributed to him of the Transmigration of Souls, and their state after their departure out of the Body; therefore that was not called into question." [71] And Keith himself, in the appendix to Croese's history, says clearly, "I never embraced it either as an Article of Faith, or as any positive Dogma in Philosophy, as I do not at present: Nor am I asham'd to say, as I am not sufficiently able, and furnished, in all respects to refute it; by evident Reasons, so nor am I to defend it." [72] Possibly his partisans were suspected of holding the doctrine more than their leader. In any case, the

[71] G. Croese, The General History of the Quakers, Eng. trans., London, 1696. pp. 168f (first occurrence of these pages in Books II and III). Caleb Pusey, who in his controversial works against George Keith and Daniel Leeds, constantly accuses Keith of holding this doctrine adduces "what he couched of this stuff in his books in the years 89 and 90 and his implicit acknowledgement in Truth and Innocency page 2 that he was concerned in writing that Revolution book, called 200 Queries" (Proteus Ecclesiasticus, [c. 1703], Phila., pp. 25–27).

[72] Ibid., Appendix, p. 10. It is probable that his interest in the subject was due to his emphasis on the historic as contrasted with the inward Christ, for it was possible when asked whether ignorant savages and infants who had not heard of Christ in the New Testament could be saved, to reply that perhaps in a future state the same soul would be given an opportunity to receive this saving knowledge. Cf. I. Sharpless in The Quakers in the American Colonies, p. 446.

reply and vindication prepared for the main body of the Society in England by George Whitehead and others in 1693 (The Christian Doctrine and Society of the People called Quakers) contained a section on the Revolution or Transmigration of Humane Souls (pp. 15f). It is suggestive of the general failure of the idea to secure acceptance that it was thought unnecessary to include this section when the same piece was appended to Sewel's History of the Quakers (in Dutch, 1717, pp. 693ff; in English in 1722, pp. 642ff). Nor can one take very seriously the statement of the irresponsible French author of the Histoire abregée de la Naissance & du Progrez du Kouakerisme published in 1692 who in his scarcely serious suggestions that George Fox is 'Mahomet ressuscite' declares (pp. 6f) that many of the Quaker sect believe in the preëxistence and transmigration of souls, and hence ought not to object to the suggestion.

How far the English literature on the subject is due to Friends it is hard to tell, since all the books known to me are either unsigned or signed by initials. As others may be able to identify these I shall list such books as I know:

1. A Dissertation concerning the Pre-existency of Souls, Being Originally Written in the Latine Tongue Several Years Since, by the Learned C.P. and now Made English by D.F., D.P. upon the Recommendation of F.M.H. their Friend.

   The epistle dedicatory signed by D.F. is addressed to Thomas Martyn of Putney, Esq. The date is 1684.

2. Two Hundred Queries moderately propounded concerning the doctrine of the Revolution of Humane Souls, and its Conformity to the Truths of Christianity, London, 1684.

   The Preface says "these were translated into English two years since" and it proposes translating two other works of which one is a Latin Tract with the title "De revolutionibus animarum tractatus primus è manuscripto haud ità pridem ex Oriente ad nos perlato ex operibus Rabbi Titzchah Loriensis Cabbalistarum Aquilae latinitate donatus."

   This work was translated into Latin from English and published in Amsterdam in 1690.

3. The Harmless Opinion of the Revolution of Humane Souls: as a probable Hypothesis and very serviceable to clear many

Doubts, and answer many Objections of Atheists against the Divine Providence and the Holy Scriptures. Modestly defended in a Reply to a late Treatise, Signed by J.H., Printed at Oxford and called by him, An Answer to some Queries proposed by W.C., or a refutation of Helmont's Pernicious Error, &c. London, 1694.

The references to F. M. van Helmont in 1 and 3 are clear. Some bibliographers actually include 2 among his works. It is, for example, so indexed in the Library of Congress. The Latin text of the CC Problemata is appended to F. M. van Helmont's Opuscula philosophica, printed at Amsterdam in 1690, and the appendix to another work of F. M. van Helmont, Paradoxale Discoursen also deals with the return of human souls and though published in Latin also, is described in its Dutch form, Amsterdam, 1693, as translated out of the English by C. K. W. Sewel, however, says quite explicitly in his History of the People called Quakers that George Keith "was believed to be concerned in the book, containing two hundred queries about that matter; great part of which, as I have been informed, he acknowledged to have been put in writing by himself, though it appeared in publick without the author's name." Further, the advertisement at the end of 2 mentions 1 as "by the same writer." I have not seen a copy of 3. Jos. Smith included it in his Supplement to a Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books, 1893, p. 12, with a notation that it is doubtful whether it was written by a Friend or not.

Beside these rather exotic forms of Jewish lore the early Quakers were concerned in Biblical Hebrew and in first hand contact with living Jews with whom they argued in both speech and writing for missionary purposes. On this subject I have written extensively elsewhere.[73] Suffice it here to mention the curiosity of George Fox who reports that when at Frederichstadt in 1677 "I had discourse with a Levite that was a Jew . . . and I went to his house . . . and he showed me their Talmud and many other Jewish books." [74] It is strangely inappropriate that of quotations from the Apocrypha in the writings of Fox the

[73] "Hebraica and the Jews in Early Quaker Interest" in Children of Light, edited by Howard H. Brinton, 1938, pp. 133–164.

[74] Short Journal, p. 244.

largest number occur not in writing to Christians in general or even to Papists but in A Looking Glass for the Jews (1674).

No doubt other striking instances could be found of the way in which early Friends yielded to the attractions of the obscure realms of thought. The material collected must here suffice as an illustration. It need not be supposed that Friends were in general more credulous or gullible than their contemporaries. They were, however, under peculiar temptations. They were especially interested in mysticism, and the line that for us separates mysticism in its saner and more practical aspects from the apocryphal, superstitious, fantastic, Hermetic, cabbalistic and alchemical was not easy for them to draw. If they drew it too extremely they would have excluded the whole spiritual heritage of mysticism as did Jeremy Taylor who wrote in 1660: [75]

> Books of mystical theology . . . have in them the most high, the most troublesome and the most mysterious nothings in the world, and little better than the effluxes of a religious madness.

If they had generally gone in for the occult in the way in which Keith and van Helmont did they would have deserved the criticisms that were levelled at them. Even for the speculative Neo-Platonist Henry More Keith, the Quaker, was too extreme. He wrote of him, for example:

> G.K. is a good honest man according to his measure, but really he is lyable to over headstrong enthusiasme, and has too lubricous a reason and luxuriant phancy.[76]

The via media as ever was hard to find, and it is striking that the Friends erred so little either to the right hand or to the left. Sometimes some of them went too far. Conversely their restraint sometimes reversed their earlier judgments. Thus before the Seventeenth Century was over even Jacob Boehme was in some quarters under the ban. His works were proscribed by the Dublin Men's Meeting of 1681,[77] while the first American publication of some

[75] Ductor Dubitantium, i. p. 218.

[76] Quoted by M. H. Nicolson, Philosophical Review, xxxix, 1930, p. 54.

[77] Barclay's Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth, p. 479. Earlier Friends had both quoted Behmen with approval, e.g., F. Ellington, Christian Information concerning these Last Times, 1664, pp. 10ff, and had written against

of his writings under the title "The Triumph of Wisdom for the Little World" by Daniel Leeds in 1688 was suppressed by authority of the Philadelphia meeting, together with other publications from the same editor.[78]

In later periods of their history few Quaker leaders followed the uncanonical or esoteric lure with which we have been dealing. It is unusual that as late as 1737 we find a Friend in Pennsylvania, albeit a very eccentric one, the famous Benjamin Lay, quoting at length from the Poimander of Hermes Trismegistus. He comments on its excellence and scarcity and on the fact that "this Mercurius is thought to have written some hundreds of years before Moses."[79] A century later a scholarly English Friend, Luke Howard, F.R.S. (1772–1864), turned his attention to trying to reinstate the Old Testament Apocrypha by translating and publishing four of the books between 1827 and 1829.[80] Finally may be mentioned that delightful account by the later "scholar gypsy" in Chapter XV of Lavengro. George Borrow, fishing in the stream that flows below "the Earl's Home," was accosted by the Quaker owner, evidently Joseph John Gurney (1788–1847) of Earlham Hall, who after some conversation led the fisherman to

---

the Behmenists (John Anderdon, One Blow at Babel, in those of the People called Behmenites, 1662). Lodowick Muggleton, in retracting his accusation of Quakers of buying no books but their own, said (A Looking-Glass for George Fox, 1668, p. 5): "I suppose that Jacob Behmont's Books were the chief Books that the Quakers bought, for there is the principle of their Religion; for they cannot go beyond that but there they build, this I know by William Smith's letters to me."

[78] Daniel Leeds was otherwise suspect, and a violent opponent of orthodox Friends like Chalkley. Perhaps also as publisher of an Almanac he was thought to come near the forbidden field of astrology. I know of few references to Friends interested in astrology. One is Joseph Helling an ex-Quaker who, in 1663, regarded "the conjunction of the stars as hopeful" for a plot against the king (Braithwaite, Second Period of Quakerism, p. 39 note). Others were dealt with by Horslydown meeting in London for "running into vain imaginations and studying astrology (ibid., p. 253). Of Helling Fox remarks in his list of renegades (Cambridge Journal, ii. p. 314): "1663. And about this time Jos: Hellen runn out . . . and he turned a very debauched and wicked man and a fortune teller." When in 1695 some Quakers had recourse to astrology and other forbidden arts at Chichester, Pennsylvania, both the local meeting and the court intervened. See A. M. Gummere, Witchcraft and Quakerism, Philadelphia, 1908, pp. 40–47.

[79] All Slave-Keepers that Keep the Innocent in Bondage Apostates, 1737, pp. 166ff. The edition quoted by Lay, as reference to the initials J. F. signed to the preface indicates, is the Divine Pymander first published in English in 1650, republished in 1657.

[80] See Joseph Smith, Catalogue, i. 983. Cf. International Journal of Apocrypha, January, 1914. Yorkshireman i, 1833, 296ff.

his study and "took from the shelf his learned books, Zohar and Mishna, Toldoth Jesu and Abarbenel."

"I am fond of these studies," said he, "which, perhaps is not to be wondered at, seeing that our people have been compared to the Jews. In one respect I confess we are similar to them: we are fond of getting money. I do not like this last author, this Abarbenel, the worse for having been a money-changer. I am a banker myself, as thou knowest."

CONSTANTINE HARMENOPOULOS'S WORK ON HERESY

In Armand Delatte, Anecdota Atheniensia (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liége, Fasc. xxxvi), Paris 1927, pp. 313–321, is found a short treatise on various Christian heresies, ending with a creed. The text is taken from a manuscript of the fifteenth century: Athens, Bibliothèque du Sénat. No. 33, ff. 240–244. Delatte remarks, "Le texte présente naturellement de nombreuses analogies avec les ouvrages bien connus sur les hérésies et particulièrement avec certains chapitres de la Panoplie dogmatique d'Euthymios Zygabenos (Patr. gr. t. 130)."

The pieces are, however, not inedita, but two works of Constantine Harmenopoulos, a distinguished canonist and philologist of the 14th century. They are found in numerous manuscripts and their text is printed in Migne P.G.150, 20–32. The creed and the work on heresies are unconnected. In Athos: Panteleemon 122, 152 (Lambros 5628, 5658), the creed appears without the work on heresies and in Athos: Vatop. 484, it precedes the latter.

The work against heresies begins abruptly οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἄρειον, followed by a brief exposition of the heresy and this formula is invariable except for the Messalians, the Bogomiles and in the Athens manuscript, the Latins who appear under the superscript περὶ σχίσματος τῶν Λατίνων. There is neither introduction nor conclusion and it is possible that the catalogue of heresies was originally intended to be incorporated in a larger work.

The Athens manuscript preserves the same curious order in presenting the heresies as does Migne's text except that the notices of the Nestorians (P.G.150, 24A) and of Eutyches and Dioscurus (P.G.150, 21D) are transposed and a section on the Latin schism (Delatte p. 319) is added after the Bogomiles. This reads:

"*Concerning the schism of the Latins.* The Latins make an addition to the divine symbol of faith and say, 'and in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son,' disregarding the Lord's word in the Gospels which says, 'the Spirit of Truth which proceeds from the Father' (Jo 15.26) and the symbol of faith which was expounded by the holy fathers for the securing and fortifying of the Orthodox Faith. Hence they teach that the Holy Trinity has two (ultimate) causes and principles. They make the (Holy) Sacrifice with unleavened bread and the oblations without warm water (in the chalice). They

fast on Saturday but eat meat, cheese and eggs on Wednesdays and Fridays. They eat things strangled and everything unclean. They drink their own urine. They do not baptize by immersion nor anoint those who are baptized. They celebrate Mass frequently on the same day at the same altar. Women and all the laity enter the sanctuary without hindrance. They teach purgatory and a term of punishment. Their priests loathe marriage and exercise their priesthood unmarried. Their monks eat meat. They permit the sick to eat meat in Lent." This scarcely enlightened account of Roman practices is undoubtedly composed of tags from earlier polemical works like the other notices.

The creed which in the Athens manuscript bears the title *ἔκθεσις τῆς ὀρθόδοξου καὶ ἀμωμήτου ἡμῶν πίστεως* is also a composite work with patches from both the Nicene and Athanasian creeds. Except for the section on the Latin schism, the variants in Delatte from Migne's text are relatively insignificant in the work on heresies, but more important in the creed:

P.G.150, 29.9 *ατελευτητον* : *αναιτιον*
13 *γεννηθεντα* + *ου ποιηθεντα* (omission by homoioteleuton in Migne).
14 om *εκ θεου αληθινου* (homoioteleuton) *συναιδιον* + *και συναναρχον*
15 *το πνευμα το αγιον*
17 om *ον*
18 *τω υιω*
τε : *συναναρχον*
18–19 om *τριαδα ομοουσιον*
19 *ομοθρονον* : *ομοθεον*
24 om *τε*
25 *διαγινωσκεται*
29 *μεν* : *μην*
31 *το πνευμα το αγιον*
35 om *τη*
37 *μιαν κυριοτητα, μιαν δεσποτειαν*
41 *υιος* + *και*
42 *εκαστος*
32.2 *αγιοις* : *οσιοις*
3 om η^2
4 om *ουτω*
6 *ανθρωπησεως*
12 *γεγεννηται*
13 *εαυτω συστησαμενος* : . . *υπησαμενος* restored by Delatte as *⟨τ⟩υπωσαμενος*.

15 *τον θεον* : *τε θεον*

15–16 *ανθρωπον* + *ολον εν τοις κολποις οντα του πατρος* Jo 1.18) *και ολον εν τοις ανθρωποις αναστρεφομενον* (omission by homoioteleuton in Migne)

16 om *τε*

18 *αδιαιρετως*, *ατρεπτως*

23 om *τε*

θεω + *και πατρι*

26 *θεον* : *χριστον*

27 om *τω*

29 *ανεληλυθε* : *ενεληλυθεν*

35 *δικαιων* + *απολαυσιν και*

The late Professor Lietzmann planned to edit a collection of Byzantine creeds. It may be hoped that if his death prevented the completion of this work, it may be taken up by others. The creed of Harmenopoulos, like the earlier one of Michael Syncellus, would occupy a prominent position in such a corpus.

ROBERT P. CASEY

BROWN UNIVERSITY